

A
Second LETTER
Com To the Reverend IV 701. 13.
Dr. SHERLOCK,
BEING
A Reply to his Answer, &c.

Proving the Doctrines maintain'd by the Doctor
in his SERMON Nov. 5. 1712. to be the Same
with those charged upon the Bishop of Bangor, as
Pernicious, in the late Report of the Committee.

With an APPENDIX relating to a Passage
or two in Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the Lord
Bishop of Bangor.

Duo cum faciunt idem, non est idem.

By ARTHUR ASHLEY SYKES, M. A.
Rector of Dry-Drayton near Cambridge.

To which is added, a
POSTSCRIPT
To the Reverend
Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester,
By the Right Reverend Father in GOD
BENJAMIN Lord Bishop of Bangor.

The SECOND EDITION.

London: Printed for JAMES KNAPTON at the Crown, and
TIM. CHILDE, at the White Hart in St. Paul's Church-yard.

Price One shilling.

SECOND LETTER

To the Reverend

DR. SHERLOCK

BEING

A Reply to his Answer

Showing the Doctrine of the Trinity to be
the same as that of the Unitarians
and that the Unitarians are not
Worshippers of Images
or of any other Creature
But of God alone

By ARTHUR AUSTIN
A Sermon Preached at St. Andrew's Church
on Sunday the 10th of May 1790

POSTSCRIPT

To the Reverend
Dr. Sherlock Dean of Chester

In the Right Hon. the Father & Sons
of the Hon. V. Lord Bishop of Exeter

The Author's Address
is at the Office of the
Printers, in Pall Mall

led
mu
Ser
blig
to
fair
from



A SECOND
LETTER

To the Reverend

Dr. *SHERLOCK*, &c.

Reverend SIR,



T the Close of the Letter I troubled you with, I express'd my Hopes that you would *help* to dissipate *the Influence* of those Tenets of the Bishop of *Ban-*
gor which the Report has cal-
led *Pernicious*, by shewing the World how much You differ from his Lordship in your Sermon preached *Nov. 5th. 1712.* I am obliged to you for your Pains, in endeavouring to set me and the World right in this Af-
fair. But as I am not satisfied, that you *disagree* from his Lordship so much as you would

seem to do, I beg your Excuse for this Second Trouble; and hope you'll think these *Excessencies of a Controversy*, p. 51. worth at least your Regarding. I grant you the Charge is merely personal: Yet I hope it may have this Effect, to resettle those weak and wavering Minds which may have been ensnared or perplexed by any of the unsound Doctrines taught and published, give me Leave still to say, equally by yourself and the Bishop of Bangor.

The properest Method that occurs to me upon this Occasion is,

First, To consider your State of the Point concerning the Magistrate's Power, as it lies dispers'd in your Answer, and to examine your Conduct thereon.

Secondly, To consider the Meaning of those Passages of his Lordship's Sermon, the Consequences of which you have entred into.

Thirdly, To enquire into the Meaning of the particular Passages of your Sermon which I produced in my former Letter, in which alone I charged you with an Agreement with his Lordship.

First, To consider your State of the Point concerning the Magistrate's Power, as it lies dispers'd in your Answer; and to examine your Conduct thereon. You begin, "It will be allowed, I suppose, that as the Magistrate derives his Power from God, and rules over reasonable Creatures, it is his proper Business to see that Obedience be paid to the Dictates
" of

“ of the Law of Reason with respect to God,
 “ as well as Men, and that Offences against
 “ them be punished.” p. 5. You did well to
 suppose that this grand Principle would be al-
 lowed you without any Proof; but 'tis too full
 of Consequences to admit it without Exami-
 nation. The Question is, What is the *proper*
Business of the Magistrate? Instead of the
 plain intelligible Answer, To take Care of,
 and secure the Civil Interests of all his Sub-
 jects; You tell us, that 'tis his *proper Business*
 to see that Obedience be paid to the *Dictates*
 of the Law of Reason with respect to God as
 well as Men, and that Offences against them
 be punished. Is the Magistrate to punish ALL
 Breaches of the *Dictates* of the Law of Rea-
 son? Is it his *proper Business* to enquire into
 ALL Cases where Men act contrary to the
 Dictates of Reason? Or is the Magistrate a
 proper Judge of Offences in such Cases? The
 Question is not, whether the Laws of every
 Nation are founded upon the Laws of Na-
 ture, but whether the Magistrate's *proper Bu-*
siness is to be the Judge and Executor of
 the Law of Reason. If you say that He is,
 I ask, Whence the Magistrate *derives* This
 Authority to punish all Offences against the
 Laws of Reason with respect to God as well
 as Men? Is this Authority *given* him by God,
 or by Men? If by God, the Place may be
 produced. If by Men, This you are desired to
 prove. Whether Mr. *Hobbs* himself would have
 ever

ever desired a better *Postulatum* than this which you have laid down, to establish that Fundamental of *Hobbism*, The Duty of being of the Magistrate's Religion, you had best consider.

You proceed, p. 6—7. "*Were Religion in general—one, plain, uniform Thing, which there was no more Reason to dispute about, than there is about the Law of Reason and Nature in moral Points; 'tis plain there would be nothing with respect to Religion left to the Magistrate, but to use his Power to enforce Obedience in Matters of Religion, as well as of Morality; and his Right to do so would be undeniable.*" You ought to have inform'd the World how it is possible to dispute about Religion in general, more than about the Law of Reason and Nature in moral Points. For what is the Difference between Religion and the Law of Reason in moral Points? i. e. between Morality and Natural Religion. The Right of the Magistrate, you say, is undeniable, to enforce Obedience in Matters of Religion, as well as of Morality, supposing One was no more disputable than the Other. 'Tis as little disputable whether a Man is obliged to Pray to God for what he wants, or to Thank him for what he has, as 'tis whether Compacts are to be observ'd, or, Man is to be injured. Yet is the Right of the Magistrate as undeniable to force a Man to pray to God for what he wants, as 'tis to punish a Highway-man for robbing, or to force a Thief to restore his ill-gotten Goods? Nay, is it possible for the Magistrate

to force a Man to Pray at all? He may indeed compel him to *utter a Form of Words*; but that would not be *praying*, more than acknowledging a Fault, whilst a Man is convinced in himself of the *Justice* of what he has done, can be called *retracting*. Religion relates, by your own Confession, to the *Worship and Service of God, and to the Principles and Methods by which Men hope to obtain his Favour*, p. 6. Has the Magistrate an *undeniable Right* to force Men to hope to obtain the Favour of God? Or is it not a Contradiction in Terms, to talk of Force in Cases of Will and Thought? Again; the *Magistrate's Right* would be undeniable to enforce Obedience in Matters of Religion, as well as Morality. To enforce Obedience to What? To what the *Magistrate thinks* plain and indisputable Duties? Or to what *every Body thinks* and allows to be plain and indisputable Duties? You'll say, this latter is supposed, where the Magistrate and every Body agree in what is plain. In this Case, the *Magistrate's Duty as he is Vicegerent of God, is to maintain the Honour of God and Religion*, p. 7. When you'll explain what you mean by *Vicegerent*, in this Case, I'll consider your Assertion.

But from *Religion in general*, you proceed to the *Christian Institution particularly*. "Were the Church, you say, every where what it ought to be, one, and the same, teaching the same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles
" pub-

“ published, and no other; so that Christians
 “ had no Reason to dispute which were true
 “ Doctrines, and which were not, it would be
 “ very proper for the Magistrate, nay ’twould
 “ be his Duty to add the Sanctions of this World
 “ to keep the People stedfast to the Duty which
 “ they acknowledged to be incumbent on them.”—

Here is such an Acknowledgment of the
 Truth of what the Bishop of BANGOR
 has been pleading for, that whatever hard
 Censures his Lordship may deserve, Mr.
 Dean of Chichester must incur the same up-
 on this Head. How much of the Contro-
 versy is given up in this Place, by that re-
 markable Concession, *Were the Church every
 where what it OUGHT to be — teaching the
 same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles pub-
 lished AND NO OTHER? OUGHT NO
 OTHER Doctrines to be published, but the same
 which Christ and his Apostles published? And
 could you censure a Bishop of our Church, for
 disclaiming the Opposite Doctrines? Could you
 with any Colour agree to a Representation to
 censure a Man for saying the very same that
 you do? Let the World judge of your Agree-
 ment in this Point, and let me make Use of
 that pretty Witticism of yours, p. 24. Dear
 Sir, don't be frightned, the Matter shall be made
 easy to you, the Consequence will be brought home
 to your Door, without any trouble to your self.
 The Bishop in his Sermon has disclaim'd all Powers
 inconsistent with Christ's sole Authority of Legi-
 slation*

lation and Judgment in Matters relating to Eternal Salvation. You tell us, *Were the Church what it OUGHT to be—teaching the same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles published and NO OTHER, i. e. the Church OUGHT to teach NO OTHER Doctrines than what Christ and the Apostles taught. If They OUGHT to teach NO OTHER Doctrines but the same and only the same which Christ and his Apostles taught, then it follows that He himself is the sole Lawgiver to his Subjects; Which is condemned by the Report.*

Bps. Sermon p. 11. Report, p. 4. 8vo. Edit.

Dr. Sherlock's Answer, p. 7.

His Lordship affirms—*As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King: And in this it is implied that He is himself the sole Lawgiver to his Subjects, and himself the sole Judge of their Behaviour in the Affairs of Conscience and eternal Salvation: And in this Sense therefore his Kingdom is not of this World, that he hath*

Were the Church every where what it OUGHT to be, one and the same, teaching the same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles published and NO OTHER. Which is, in effect, asserting that the Church Ought to teach the same Doctrines which Christ and the Apostles published, and NO OTHER

in THOSE Points left behind him no visible human Authority, no Vicegerents who can be said properly to supply his Place, no Interpreters upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend, no Judges over the Consciences or Religion of his People.

But from this Concession, I pass to your Inference, If the Church were, *what it ought to be, 'twould be the Magistrate's Duty to add the Sanctions of this World.* I ask, First, To *what* is it his Duty to add the Sanctions of this World? And 2dly, *Why* is it his Duty? You tell us, "For — how could the Magistrate of
 " this World better employ that Portion of
 " Power intrusted to him, than by applying it to
 " those very Points, to which God has applied
 " the Sanctions of the other World? Can he
 " have a better Example to follow, than that
 " of God himself, in using the Power entrusted
 " to him by God? Or are those Points not fit to
 " be promoted by Rewards and Punishments,
 " to which God himself has annexed Rewards
 " and Punishments?" p. 8. The End of the Magistrate's Power is the Security of our Civil Interests, and doth not reach to *all* Things in which 'tis possible for him to employ his
 Power

Power well. If he employs his Power in doing such things as are agreeable to the End of his having that Power entrusted to him, He executes his Office faithfully, and is not accountable for more. The Power of the Magistrate extends it self no farther than those who gave him that Power thought fit to extend it; and 'tis not an imaginary Opinion of Benefits which possibly he may be able to attain, which will authorize the Use of his Power to *other* Intents and *other* Ends than what he received his Commission for. *Were the Church therefore what it ought to be, teaching the same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles published and No Other; and had all Christians a perfect Concord in their Opinions, yet it would not follow that the Civil Magistrate's Duty was to add the Sanctions of this World to keep People stedfast to their Duties in Religion. You say the Laws of Christ affect the Happiness of Societies as well as of private Persons: And what then? It doth not follow that the Magistrate may or can add Sanctions to the Laws of Christ, as such, because the Laws of Christ affect the Happiness of Society. 'Tis a Law of Christ, that we should Love the Lord with all our Hearts, with all our Minds, and with all our Souls, and our Neighbour as our selves. This Principle is universally receiv'd, how little soever practised. Has the Magistrate an undeniable Right to add his Sanctions to this Law, or to say,*

whoſoever *Loves* the Lord as Chriſt has required, ſhall have 1000 *l.* would not this be ridiculous, ſince he could not ever know who 'tis that *has* this Love, and conſequently could never give the Reward annexed? The Love of God and of our Neighbour is a Principle which affects the Publick in its Conſequences; and thoſe Conſequences, *i. e.* external Acts, may be rewarded or puniſhed. But as the Laws of Chriſt are what affect the Soul, are ſuch as reach the Conſcience, and are nothing if the Will and Conſcience go not with them, ſo the Actions of Men are all that the Magiſtrate can take into Conſideration, and he can only add the Sanctions of this World to them.

3dly. Your Arguments for the Magiſtrate's *undeniable Right* to add the Sanctions of this World to the Laws of Chriſt, ſuppoſing them *univerſally received*, are ſuch as will equally hold now that there are ſuch *Differences* in the World, and will juſtify any Perſecution that a Magiſtrate ſhall have at Heart. Suppoſe the Maſter of the *Temple* here had been an Abbot in *France* in the late King's Reign: and to revoke the Edict of *Nantz*, he had told *Lewis* the Great; Sir, *How could the Magiſtrate of this World better employ that Portion of Power intruſted to him, than by applying it to thoſe very Points to which God has applied the Sanctions of the other World? Can he have a better Example to follow, than that*

of

of God himself in using the Power intrusted to him by God? Or are those Points not fit to be promoted by Rewards and Punishments, to which God himself has annexed Rewards and Punishments? p. 8. Whether these would not have been excellent Motives to raise Dragoons, and to worry the Protestants as he pleas'd, I desire you would consider.

4thly, But let us put this Reasoning of yours in a contrary Light. Were the Church every where what it ought to be, teaching the same Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles published, and no other, so that Christians had no Reason to dispute which were true Doctrines and which were not, it would be the Magistrate's Duty, you say, to add the Sanctions of this World. But as the Church is not what it ought to be, and teaches other Doctrines than Christ and the Apostles did, and Christians do dispute about Doctrines; what is the Magistrate's Duty here? Why, certainly, by your own Argument, Sir, 'tis his Duty not to add the Sanctions of this World. For if it be his Duty because the Church is what it ought to be; where the Church is not what it ought to be, 'tis not his Duty to make use of or apply his Power to those Points to which God has annexed the Sanctions of the other World

Or take your Reasoning thus: The Magistrate's Right would be undeniable to add the Sanctions of this World to Religion, were
Reli.

Religion one plain, uniform Thing, which could not be *disputed*. But *disputable* Opinions being brought by degrees into Religion, This alters the Case. Whence then has the Magistrate the *undeniable Right*, supposing Religion *indisputable*? Has he it from Revelation, or from the Law of Nature? If from Revelation, I don't question but you can produce the Place: But if from the Law of Nature; then the Magistrate could only lose his Power in *disputable* Cases, not in *plain, indisputable* Ones. Now has the Magistrate a *Right* to add the Sanctions of this World, *e. g.* to Prayer, as 'tis a Religious Act and an *indisputable* Duty? He may indeed annex a Thousand Pounds a Year to the *repeating* so many *Pater-Nosters*, or any other Prayers; that is, to the external Acts of Religion; but to what is *properly* and *strictly* Prayer, *i. e.* a serious, sensible, true Devotion, he can annex no Rewards, because he cannot be a Discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart. *Disputable* or *Indisputable*, makes no difference in the Case, since the Magistrate cannot be obliged to *Duties* which are impossible for him to perform.

You quit then the Theory of the Magistrate's Duty in plain Cases, and tell us, "*But the Case in Fact is, That the Magistrate may possibly misapply his Rewards and Punishments, when he interposes in Matters of a Religious Nature, since many Points of mere Speculation, or such at least as have no direct*"

" In-

" *Influence on Practical Duties, have by Degrees*
 " *been brought into Religion, and Churches have*
 " *divided on those Points. Thus between us*
 " *and the Church of Rome, there are many Con-*
 " *troversies of THIS sort——about Auricu-*
 " *lar Confession, Penance, and the like, p.*
 " *8.*" The Magistrate may POSSIBLY
 misapply! Look, Sir, into the World and see
 if it be but POSSIBLE for the Magistrate
 to misapply his Rewards and Punishments. One
 would think that Mr. Dean of Chichester had
 never heard of Dragooning, Fire and Faggot,
 or of any Persecutions or Penal Laws. May
 POSSIBLY misapply! If you can name One
 single Country in the whole World, where
 Rewards and Punishments have not been mis-
 applied in Matters of Religion, I'll engage to
 name you Twenty where they have. Look
 but cross the Seas to Italy, France, Spain,
 Germany, Turkey, where you please, and see
 if it be but POSSIBLE for the Magistrate
 to misapply his Sanctions. Again, You tell us,
 of Points of mere Speculation, or such at least
 as have no direct Influence on practical Duties,
 brought into Religion. OF THIS sort you
 reckon Auricular Confession, Penance, and the
 Like. Do you really think Auricular Confes-
 sion and Penance, to have no direct Influence
 upon practical Duties? Or can you call Them
 Points of mere Speculation? In reality, for
 Fear you should be forced to agree with the
 Bishop

Bishop of Bangor, you resolve against agreeing with the plainest common Sense.

But how much soever we may differ in the Principles before considered, yet we are at last agreed in *This*; *so to preserve the Authority of the Magistrate in Matters of Religion, as not to set him up to be a Discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, or to give him a Right to force upon Men Opinions and Doctrines which their Reason and Understanding cannot admit, p. 9.* Or as you say you have done in your 5th of Nov. Sermon, in *so asserting his Authority, as not to subject him and his Government to all the extravagant Efforts of what Men call Conscience; so confining it, as not to give him a Right to hurt Men for mere Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Religion, p. 10.*

But then here the Lord Bishop of Bangor joins, and agrees with us too. And in his *Preservative* and *Sermon* reaches exactly the same Doctrine. In his Sermon, p. 23. He tells us, *You read.—No Orders for the Kind and Charitable Force of Penalties, or Capital Punishments, to make Men think and chuse aright; No calling upon the Secular Arm, whenever the Magistrate should become Christian, to enforce his Doctrines, or to back his Spiritual Authority.* In his *Preservative* indeed I do not at present recollect a Passage where his Lordship speaks against the Right of Princes to *force upon Men Opinions*; but then the

Other

Other Part of our Agreement is so plain, that I cannot forbear setting it in this Light.

Preservative, p. 59-60,

Whatever affects the Civil Power—becomes a Matter of a Civil Nature.—It is of no Importance upon what it is originally founded—whether it be embraced—as part of the Gospel or not.

It may be an Article of some Mens Religion, and their Consciences may be so framed as to direct them to it. But —(if it affects the Civil Power) it becomes truly of a Civil Nature —And whatever is necessary to the hindring that Evil, is likewise so far of a Civil Nature, and the Duty and the Right of the Civil Power.

Dr. Sherlock's Answer, pag. 10.

I have so asserted his (the Magistrate's) Authority, as not to subject him, and his Government to all the extravagant Efforts of what Men call Conscience. Again. Conscience ought not to be forced, but that Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions. But then to secure the Magistrate from being insulted by Men who pretend to act according to their Conscience; their Actions, I think, without any regard had to the Principle from whence they arise, ought to be, and are subject to the Jurisdiction of the Magistrate. ibid. p. 29.

D

I

I thought, Sir, upon the *stating the Point* as you have, we were agreed at last. But the Bishop of Bangor's Name has something in it so frightful, that I perceive you start at the Thought of coming so near an Agreement. You take Care therefore to explain those last cited Words, p. 29. away thus. *And 'tis in this Sense that I have said in the Sermon more than once* (viz. in the Sense of the immediate preceding Words just now quoted, p. 29.) That the Magistrate has nothing to do with Conscience; that is, *he has nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience to find the Errors of it; and when Conscience is pleaded in Justification of evil Actions, he has nothing to do with it neither,* p. 30. "This is *disentangling and distinguishing your self from the B. of Bangor,*" as a Friend of yours suggested "you had *Head, Heart, and Conscience* clear enough to do," with a Witness. Let me repeat it: *Conscience ought not to be forced, but that Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions. But then to secure the Magistrate from being insulted by Men who pretend to act according to Conscience, their Actions, without any regard had to the Principle from whence they arise, ought to be and are subject to the Jurisdiction of the Magistrate:* In this Sense I have said—The Magistrate has nothing to do with Conscience, *that is, He has nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience to find the Errors of it; and when Conscience is pleaded in*

Justi-

Justification of Evil Actions, he has nothing to do with it neither. Are these Propositions the same, Conscience ought not to be forc'd by the Magistrate, And, the Magistrate has nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience to find the Errors of it? But this I shall consider again by and by, when I come to your Sermon. Here I'll observe only that you have told us, what you mean by the former Proposition, Conscience ought not to be forced, by adding, but that Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions. Or if this lets us not enough into your Meaning, you explain it more, p. 31. I was against driving Men into doubtful or false Opinions, in opposition to the Light of their own Minds. If the Magistrates driving Men into doubtful or false Opinions, can be explain'd, into, examining to find the Errors of Mens Conscience, I shall give over all Hopes of holding you to any thing. Taking then the State of this Point, as you have settled it, p. 29. 'tis thus. Churches have divided upon Points of mere Speculation—and—Men will always differ about them. Here arises the Difficulty about the Magistrate's Power. Shall he interpose with his Authority, and espouse one Side in doubtful Cases, and force all into his Opinion? Or shall he be excluded, and let Mens Consciences work as they please without Controul?—Conscience in these Cases ought not to be forced, but that Men should be at Liber-

ty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions. But then to secure the Magistrate from being insulted by Men who pretend to act according to their Conscience, their Actions without any regard had to the Principle from whence they arise ought to be, and are subject to the Jurisdiction of the Magistrate. Here I think we are come to general Principles, and 'tis Time to examine your Conduct upon them. And

First, Consistent with these Principles you assert the Magistrate's Authority to support true Religion, and the Honour of God in the World. i. e. Consistent with asserting his Authority so as not to subject him and his Government to all the extravagant Efforts of what Men call Conscience, and, with not giving him a Right to hurt Men for mere Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Religion, p. 9. Can you deny that his Lordship is against securing the Magistrate from the extravagant Efforts of Conscience as much as you are? Can you find no Passage in the Book and Sermon which directly assert such an Authority? Or is not great part of the Preservative founded upon this single Principle, That the State has a Right to every thing necessary to its Defense? And, That Men are not to be hurt for Opinions in Matters of Religion, nothing can be more express than the Sermon is. What Reason then or Pretence can you have to deny his Lordship the Liberty of asserting to the Magistrate

an Authority to support true Religion and the Honour of God in this World, consistent with these Principles? His Lordship's Principles and your own being here exactly the same, whatever Consequences really agree with yours, must necessarily agree with his. But

Secondly, His Lordship is charged in your Report with *impugning and impeaching the Regal Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical, and the Authority of the Legislature, to enforce Obedience in Matters of Religion by Civil Sanctions.* You was charged with the *same Crime* in the Letter addressed to you, as holding the *same Doctrines and Positions* with his Lordship. What is the Method, Sir, which you have taken to clear your self of the *same Crime*? Why, you cite several Passages out of *Two other Sermons*, which were *never* mentioned, in order to shew what you have *publickly declared upon that Subject*, pag. 26, 27, 28. Will you allow the Bishop the *same Method* of Defence? Or do you claim the *sole Right* to it? Will you permit him to look into his *other Writings*, supposing he had Occasion for such a *Shift*, to shew what he has *publickly declared* too upon that Argument?

Thirdly, When you have produced your Vouchers out of Sermons not cited by me, You say, p. 28. *When the Letter-writer has reconciled These to the Bishop's Doctrine, I'll look more for him.* I am willing to save you that Trouble. 'Tis not my Design to recon-
cile

cile what you have said in all your Sermons to what the Bishop has said. No. I know it impossible to reconcile you to your self. But I insist upon it as common Justice, that you should allow his Lordship the Right to the Plea which you actually use your self, and then you shall be allow'd to threaten as much as you please, should he (the Bishop) *resolve to insist on the Justification of his Sermon, he will find, (if I have any Judgment) that he has a Matter of another Nature upon his Hands, than ever yet he was engaged in,* P. 53.

4thly. I cannot but observe that in the Report both the Book and Sermon, are said to contain *Doctrines which impugn and impeach the Regal Supremacy, &c.* Now, What One single Passage have you produced out of the Book to justify this Charge? Not One. And here let me ask you, has not his Lordship in that very Book, set in the clearest Light the Authority of the Magistrate? Has he not proved and insisted for several Pages together upon the Supremacy of the Civil Magistrate? Is not This very thing the Fundamental Principle of that Book? I therefore ask again, with what Conscience was that Book charged with *impugning the Supremacy?* Look to p. 59, &c. *Whatever affects the Civil Power, let it be in its first Origin never so much of an Ecclesiastical or Religious Nature, tho' esteem'd an Article, or Duty of Religion by those who embrace it,* This

This makes no difference, it becomes a Matter of Civil Nature—whatever it be, if it directly affects the Civil Power, it becomes—a matter of Civil Nature and is made of necessity the Object of the Magistrate's Care and Concern, &c. If you had ever read his Lordship's *Preservative*, cou'd you have charged his Lordship with these following Consequences, p. 24. *Because Virtue and Charity, and the contrary Vices shall be rewarded and punished hereafter, must the World be torn to pieces in the mean while without Remedy? And will it be sufficient for the Magistrate to say when he is call'd upon, to punish the Offences against Virtue and Charity: This is Religion; these are Laws of Christ, he has annexed Rewards and Punishments to them hereafter, and I will have nothing to do with them: By what Name are these Arts to be called, to charge these Consequences upon his Lordship's Sermon, at the same Time when the Book which fully answered these Consequences lay before you; and yet you could urge Two Sermons, One preached eight Years before That referr'd to, the other two Years after it, in behalf of your self? Is this Proceeding to be justified upon any Rules of Honour or Justice? Book and Sermon are Both charged with impugning the Supremacy. The Fundamental Principle of the Book, is the Supremacy of the Magistrate, proving him in all Causes and over all Persons Supream. Could this, or ought it to be overlook'd*

look'd in a Case where the Report charges Book and Sermon with these *pernicious Tenets*? Or ought it to have no Regard paid it by You, Sir, whilst in your own Defence you can cite Sermons no way concern'd in this Controversy?

5thly, You are charged in the Letter to you with an Agreement with his Lordship, in asserting the same Things as his Lordship has in each of the Passages cited from the Bishop's Sermon under the Second Article of the Report. Your particular Evasion shall be examined in another Place. Here you have stated the Magistrate's Power, and have granted enough to my Purpose. The Substance of what his Lordship has said in his Sermon upon this Topick, is This; *No one hath Authority either to make New Laws for Christ's Subjects— or to judge, censure or punish the Servants of another Master in matters relating purely to Conscience and Salvation, p. 16.* You grant that the Church hath no Temporal Authority, over and over, p. 31, 37, &c. And you assert that the Magistrate has no right to force upon Men Opinions, or to hurt Men for mere Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Religion, p. 9, 10. Is it not the same thing, not to hurt Men for Opinions in Matters of Religion, which You own neither Church nor State have a Right to do. And to say that no Man can punish the Servants of another Master in Matters relating purely to Conscience and

and Salvation? You say, *Conscience* (in Matters of mere Speculation) *ought not to be forced*, p. 29. His Lordship says, *no Man can judge, censure or punish—in Matters relating to Conscience*. Indeed, granting this Principle, *that neither Church nor State have a Right to drive, p. 31. Men into Opinions*; and that *Men should be at Liberty, p. 29. as you say, to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions*, all that his Lordship has taught follows by necessary Consequence. Especially if we add that one Principle laid down by your self in your Sermon p. 8. *That Temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the Laws and Edicts of Christ's Kingdom*. This cuts off all *Fines, Banishments, Engines of this World as not proper Instruments of Perswasion, as not fit to support a Kingdom which is not of this World*, and shews the Absurdity of making use of *the Frowns and Discouragements of this World, to attend upon Conscience and Religion*. Indeed his Lordship's Adversaries are so sensible of this Consequence that they are forc'd to distort his Meaning to make out something *fit* to be censured, or else they deny the Principles which you have been so kind as to grant. How far *your Zeal* has transported you to *distort* the Meaning of his Lordship, is what I next proposed, *viz.*

Secondly, to consider the meaning of those Passages of his Lordship's Sermon, the Consequences of which you have enter'd into:

E

This

This you know Sir, is foreign to the Business of the Letter address'd to you ; and 'tis so remarkably introduced p. 11. that you *did not intend to preclude his Lordship from any other Sense or Meaning which he shall think fit to insist on*, that I could not but smile to find you afterwards *threatning his Lordship, should he resolve to insist on the Justification of his Sermon, he will find, (If I have any Judgment,) that he has a Matter of another Nature upon his hands, than ever yet he was engaged in.* p. 53. But I think my self obliged to follow you, since you have led the way. The First Passage produced is cited by the Report, and the Letter to you p. 10. from the 14th of the Bishop's Sermon.

It is the same thing as to Rewards and Punishments, to carry forward the great End of his Kingdom. If any Men upon Earth have a Right to add to the Sanctions of his Laws, that is, to increase the number or alter the Nature of the Rewards and Punishments of his Subjects in Matters of Conscience or Salvation ; They are SO FAR Kings in his stead, and reign in their own Kingdom, and not in his.

This Passage his Lordship has engaged more at large to explain, and fix this Point in his Answer to the Report. However, 'tis already, says the Bishop, as clear a PROPOSITION as this, So far as new Sanctions are brought into Christ's Religion, so far new Sanctions are brought in. This you very sincerely call advancing this very consistent Notion, That as
far

far as New Sanctions are brought into Christs Religion, so far New Sanctions are brought in. Suppose his Lordship had said that his Assertion was as clear as that *two* are equal to *two*, or any other Identical Proposition, purely to shew the great *Clearness* of it, would you have triumphed as you do, or could you have hinted at *Difficulties* unsurmountable, or talk'd of a *Cause gasping for Life*, p. 12. when it arises from a plain Mistake of your own, who first invent a ridiculous Sense, and then expose it.

The three next Pages are spent in proving that Dr. *Snape's* Comment upon these Words, *They are so far Kings in his Stead, and reign in their own Kingdom, and not in his*, is not hard nor unjust. The Dr's. Comment complain'd of is, *They dethrone Christ from his Spiritual Kingdom.* No regard is had to those Words of his Lordship upon which so much depends, SO FAR; but notwithstanding that *Limitation*, you will have it *general* and *universal*, *They dethrone Christ.* If they dethrone Christ, then Christ is *totally* exempted from *All* Power. But his Lordship's Proposition directly asserts *some* Power still to Christ, tho' joined with That of Other Men, therefore it must be *hard* and *Unjust* to comment upon his Lordship's Words so as to make them mean a *total* Exemption from *all* Power, *i. e.* a *Dethroning* Christ. Perhaps upon this Intimation you may be able to see those significant Words, SO FAR, tho' you were *sur-*

prized, p. 14. i. e. frightened, 24: so much as not to observe them in his Lordship: Especially upon telling you, that you yourself have cited them at least *nine* several times in the compass of five Pages, without once considering the Intent or Meaning of them.

Dr. *Snape* indeed asserts that you, Sir, *have prov'd for him that his Lordship's Expressions prove no less than dethroning Christ from his Spiritual Kingdom*, p. 59. of his *Second Letter*, &c. I appeal to the Readers Eyes and Judgment, if They are, or if it be possible to prove, these Two Propositions to be the same; *They are SO FAR Kings in Christ's stead, and reign in their own Kingdom, as they alter the Nature of the Rewards and Punishments of Christ's Subjects; And, They dethrone Christ from his Spiritual Kingdom, who alter the Nature of the Rewards and Punishments of Christ's Subjects.* You, Sir, were in the Right, p. 14. to drop those Words, *SO FAR*, and roundly to assert, *That whoever adds Sanctions to Christ's Laws, ARE Kings in his Stead, to prove his Lordship's Meaning MUST be, that they divest Christ of his Kingdom.*

The Letter-writer's Exposition of this Passage, you say, is very extraordinary. His Lordship says, p. 13. Lett. If any Men upon Earth have a Right, &c. Thereby excluding Laity or Clergy, Church or State, from altering the Nature of Rewards and Punishments in matters of Conscience and Salvation

vation. *What does the good Man mean by excluding them from altering what 'tis impossible they ever should alter, p. 15, 16?* The Question is not whether the Word *alter* be proper or not, or *whether you could ever understand what his Lordship meant by altering the Nature of Christ's Rewards and Punishments.* But what is my *Exposition* of this Passage? What is my *extraordinary Exposition*? I used the Bishop's Words, and told you what he says, and never attempted at *any* Comment upon them, except the putting for, *Any Men upon Earth, the Terms Laity or Clergy, Church or State*; and you cry out upon the *Letter-writer's extraordinary Exposition* of this Passage in the Word *alter*. Yes; but *the Letter-writer, you say, makes this altering to be the whole of what his Lordship affirms, p. 16.* Supposing I did, is this the *extraordinary Exposition*, to make the *whole* of what his Lordship says, to be the *whole*? What, is it a Crime in me not to *abuse* his Lordship? *Hinc illæ Lachrymæ.* But after all, I neither *expound* this Passage, nor give any other Terms than what were before me in the *Report*, from which I transcribed it; I neither declare this *altering* to be the *Whole*, nor a *Part* of what his Lordship affirms, nor make any other use of it, than to shew that you are of the *same* Opinion with his Lordship in saying, *The Church has no Right to impose Penal Laws in any Case; In Matters purely of a Religious Nature the State has*

no Right neither. Sermon 5th. Nov. p. 12.

But the Rewards and Punishments, his Lordship tells us, are the future Rewards and Punishments of another World, how then should any Mortal alter them? add what you will, yet still They will remain unalterable. And therefore you cou'd never understand what his Lordship meant by altering the Nature of Christ's Rewards and Punishments, p. 16. The Meaning I think is evident, as I apprehend it. The Sanctions of Christ's Laws are future Rewards and Punishments. If any Men have a Right to add Temporal Rewards and Punishments to Them, they increase the Number, and they alter the Nature of them, because after that Addition, the Sanctions which were before solely Spiritual, now are made Spiritual and Temporal too. If the Penalty of a Law now be 5 l. and any one should afterwards make it not only 5 l. but a Months Imprisonment too, the Nature of the Punishment is altered by that Addition.

P. 17. We come to the great Charge. His Lordship's Doctrine being laid together amounts to this. 'Tis an Invasion of the Kingdom of Christ, to add Sanctions to the Laws of Christ. But the Laws of Christ are almost all Laws of Reason and Nature, and are intended to make us perform the Will of God. Therefore for Princes to add Sanctions to make Men obey the Laws of Reason and Nature or perform the Will of God, is an Invasion of the Kingdom of Christ. I

I have put this into Form, that his Lordships Doctrine may more evidently appear; and in Imitation of his Lordship, who seems in his late Performances to be grown very fond of Mood and Figure.

You, Sir, have had greater Things to mind than Syllogism, *i. e.* strict Reasoning; and therefore you may be excused for erring against the first Rules of Logick. Your Minor Proposition is *Particular*; the *Laws of Christ* are almost all *Laws of Reason*, And your Consequence is *Universal*, to make Men Obey the *Laws of Reason*. But this is a small Matter among Friends, as you say, p. 50. 'Tis but just such Reasoning as this, *Almost all Men think you cannot disentangle yourself in this Controversy; Therefore all Men think so.*

But as in this Point lies the strength of your Cause, I'll try to set it in a clear Light. His Lordship's Words are very clear. *The Laws of Christ are Declarations, p. 17. relating to the Favour of God in another State after this. They are Declarations of those Conditions to be performed in this World on our part, without which God will not make us happy in that to come. And they are almost All general Appeals to the Will of that God; to his Nature, known by the common Reason of Mankind, and to the Imitation of that Nature which must be our Perfection.* So it happens that the Terms *Nature and Reason*, are mentioned in
this

this Account of the Laws of Christ, tho' *Nature* is peculiarly confined to God in this Place, and distinguish'd from *Reason* as much as was possible. The Laws of Christ are almost *All general Appeals*—to *His*, i. e. God's *Nature*. How is God's *Nature* known? Why, by the common *Reason* of Mankind. And yet the *Nature* known, and the Means *by which* 'tis known, is One and the self-same with Mr. Dean of *Chichester*, in order to force the Bishop to say what 'tis convenient to make him say. When this Rack has stretched the Joints of his Lordships Words far enough, then this Conclusion is drawn, p. 6. and again, p. 17. *Whoever excludes the Magistrate from adding Sanctions to the Laws of Christ, must exclude him from adding Sanctions to the Laws of Reason and Nature.*

However, allowing you Sir, that the Laws of Christ are almost all *Laws and Dictates* of Reason and Nature, yet your Consequence is to be proved, *viz.* Because the Magistrate is excluded from adding Sanctions to the Laws of Christ, THEREFORE he is excluded from adding Sanctions to the Laws of Reason and Nature. Civil Government was instituted for the procuring and preserving of Mens *Civil Interests*, and in consequence the Magistrate is vested with all Powers that are sufficient for those Ends. Whatever affects the Civil Interests of his Subjects comes under his Cognizance, and he has a Right to punish

or reward Men according as they hinder or promote those Ends. 'Tis found necessary to secure to every Man his Property, that Theft should be punished in some Cases with Hanging, in others with Whipping, or by ways which the Magistrate has thought most proper to restrain that Enormity. 'Tis a Law of Christ too, *Thou shalt not steal*, and the Penalty of it is, Exclusion of the Kingdom of Heaven. Here is plainly a double Sanction to the Law against Theft, a Temporal and a Spiritual one. The Question is, if the Magistrate's hanging a Man for Theft be *adding* a Sanction to the Law of Christ. The Answer is easy, The Magistrate concerns not himself with the future Punishment of Theft, nor any ways considers it as a Breach of the Law of Christ. His Power is limited to the good of the Commonwealth, and his Sanctions *solely* regard that : So that tho' he has no Authority to add Sanctions to the Laws of Christ as such, yet he is not debarr'd from adding Sanctions to the Laws of Reason as they affect the State. To shew you that the Magistrate doth not consider his Sanctions as Sanctions of Christ's Laws, however by accident the same, the Magistrate often remits those very Crimes, which yet will be punished by Christ, and punishes those very Acts which will be pardoned by Christ. But then if Christ's Laws were the Laws to which the Sanctions were added, the Magistrate must necessarily look

F

upon

upon Offences, not by the Standard of his own Laws, but by the Standard of Christ's, and punish or remit, as Christ will do at the last Day. 'Tis just the same too in the Case of Rewards, which shews how *unjust* the Accusation is, that his Lordship's Positions tend *to set Religion and Irreligion, the Worship of God, and the Neglect of it, upon an equal Foot in this World.* p. 25. The Magistrate has a Right to *reward* Virtue, and 'tis his *Duty* to do it equally, as 'tis to punish Vice. But why is it his *Duty*? You will not say, because God has *commanded* it by any *Revelation*. For 'twas equally the *Duty* of *Julius Cæsar*, to whom no such express Command was given, as 'tis of any Christian Magistrate whatever. Yet when *Julius Cæsar* rewarded any Virtue, you will not say I hope that he *added a Sanction to the Laws of Christ*. Besides, the Laws of Christ are the Rules by which we must be judged at the last Day by the great Searcher of Hearts. If therefore outward Conformity be not the sole thing to which Sanctions are annexed by Christ, but something else which reaches to the Thoughts and Heart: 'Tis evident that no Man can have a Right to add to the Sanctions of Christ's Laws, because no Man can be sure when those Laws in many instances are broken.

But in Cases where it is *visible* that Men break the Laws of Christ, can the Magistrate interpose? If it affects the State, no doubt he can;

can ; if it doth not affect it, 'tis as plain he cannot. For what Sanctions can any Man have a Right to add to make a Christian *Love* his Neighbour, who can never know whether a Man complies or not.

The Confusion in all this Matter plainly arises from hence, that Men do not distinguish between the *Religious* and *Civil* Nature of the same Action, but usually they call by the same Name, whatever has the same Appearance. e. g. Prayer to God is no doubt a *Religious* Act, when it proceeds from a due Sense of what we want, and from a Consciousness of the Power, Goodness and Kindness of God. But if the same Form of Words and the same Postures of Body are made use of either to avoid some Temporal Inconveniences, or to obtain some Temporal Advantages, such as are annexed to frequenting Churches, it is call'd indeed *Prayer*, but 'tis not a *Religious* but a *Civil* Action. So far as a Man prays from the sincerity of his Heart to God, so far his Prayers are strictly *Religious* Acts : But when Rewards and Punishments are annexed, and Men perform those Acts *on Account* of the Rewards or Punishments, so far the Action, be it what you please, ceases to be *Religious*. Suppose the only thing which hinders a Man from Robbing or from Murdering the next Man he meets with, is the *Fear* of being hanged ; the Obedience to those Laws, *Thou shalt do no Murder, Thou shalt not steal*, is not

an Act of Religion, nor will it be rewarded as such, but 'tis purely Civil, notwithstanding the Laws of Christ and of the Magistrate are exactly the same.

Your Mood and Figure Argument is therefore false in the Form of drawing it up, and next, the Consequence is not proved, nor can be by all the Art you have, unless you can prove that a Heathen Magistrate that never heard of the Laws of Christ, necessarily adds Sanctions to the Laws of Christ, by rewarding Virtue, or by punishing Vices.

As soon as you have triumph'd over his Lordship in your *Mood and Figure*, your very next Words are, *The Letter-writer has another Exposition in Favour of his Lordship*, p. 18. Lett. *which he meant, I suppose to extend to all that his Lordship has said on This Head.* Another Exposition? of what? Am I not treating upon *another* distinct Head? Have I not ended what I said upon *this* Head, p. 14. of the *Letter*? Or have I repeated it again, p. 18? Or *There* so much as hinted at what his Lordship *has said on this Head*? No. Not a word. What Grounds then have you for this *Supposal*? However I take this Opportunity of *confirming* you in your *strong Presumption that the Letter had not gone thro' his Lordship's Hand*; For I assure you, His Lordship never saw nor heard of the Letter to you, till after it was Printed. The *Evasion*, as you call my Exposition, of the other Passage, shall be considered in its proper Place, But here
is

is the Place to examine what you mean by that Threat, Printed in Capitals, *The Letter-writer has offered it to his* (viz. Lordship's) *Consideration* ; *when it lies before him, he* (the Bishop) *will find that* SOMETHING *he must part with, and I heartily wish him the happier Choice.* Do you mean that his Lordship must renounce his Sermon, or renounce Bangor ? Must he disclaim his Doctrines, or *part with* his Bishoprick ? Or what do you mean by SOMETHING *he must part with* ? Is not this an excellent Instance of the Power of *Force and Worldly Pain* to promote the Service of Truth, of Honour, and Honesty, and Conscience ? What are you afraid of, suppose his Lordship *be* in an Error ? Dare you not trust the Cause of Truth against all the Subtilties of Error, when Men are at Liberty to search, and enquire ? In short, you, Sir, may vent your Spleen against his Lordship, but the World will be the more confirmed that the Application of *Force, or Flattery, Worldly Pleasure or Pain*, would to Sense be prov'd *contrary to the Interest of true Religion*, as well as *opposite to the Maxims upon which Christ founded his Kingdom*, should such Threats be executed.

The next Sentence which you mention from his Lordship is p. 19. *The Sanctions of Christ's Laws are Rewards, &c.* — *nay, not the much lesser Negative Discouragements that belong to human Society.* He was far from thinking that these could be the Instruments of such a Persuasion,

sion, *as he thought acceptable to God.* Here you cannot deny that his Lordship is speaking of the Rewards and Punishments of this World as *Instruments of Perswasion.* My Exposition therefore of another Passage, where his Lordship is speaking directly of the Application of *Worldly Pleasure, and Pain,* and where he mentions expressly *Force and Perswasion* together, as he doth p. 21. of his Sermon, is not a *poor Evasion,* as you would have it, but will prove the Truth. You give up here the *Pains of Prisons, Banishment, Fines, or any lesser and more moderate Penalties,* as not the proper *Instruments of Perswasion.* But then his Lordship you think *mistakes the Nature and Tendency of Negative Discouragements; which are not meant as Instruments of Perswasion to those who dissent from the Church, but meerly as a Security to the Church from those who would destroy it.* Does his Lordship any where say that *Negative Discouragements* are more the *Instruments of Perswasion* than *Prisons or Fines?* Are not the one equally so as much as the Other? But we must not stop here, tho' this is sufficient to vindicate his Lordship, But I ask, what is the end of *fining or imprisoning* Dissenters from the Church? What is the *Nature and Tendency* of Those Punishments? Is it to *persuade* them to Conformity? No. For you yourself tell us p. 29. *that Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions.* What

What then are they for ? You can't deny but *they will secure the Church as well as Negative Discouragements* : and consequently if *Negative Discouragements* are not sufficient for the End propos'd, you ought to rise higher for your Security. But whether you will say that or no ; are not *Negative Discouragements, Marks* set upon People as *unfit* or *improper* to serve the State ? If they are, what makes them *unfit* and *improper* ? 'Tis plain, nothing but their *Opinions* in matters of Religion. But you yourself acknowledge that *Men shou'd be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in choosing their Opinions*, p. 29. And, *that the Magistrate has nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience, to find the Errors of it*, p. 30. If this be the Case, the Magistrate ought not to set a *Mark* upon People for their *Opinions*, unless their *Opinions* be inconsistent with the Safety of the Publick. Every Man has equally a natural Right to serve his Country, and the Magistrate, you say, is not to be made a *Discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart*, p. 9. What is it then that deprives a Man of this Right ? Or what is it which renders him *improper* and *unfit* ? As often as you reply, *Opinions in Religion* ; so often will I refer you to your self in Places where you grant, that *Men have a Right to follow the best Light they can get*. This is a Right we have from Nature, and prior to all Others, and therefore no Man ought to deprive us of it. 2dly, What is the *End* of *Negative Discouragements* ?

couragements? They are, you say, *merely as a Security to the Church.* What is the Church? This Secret we are let into presently. *Negative Discouragements* are compared by you to *Locks and Bolts, which serve to shut the Door against such as would force in to spoil you of your Goods.* To secure the Church then is to secure the Goods, the Revenues of the Church, which I commend You for taking Care of, that are Master of the Temple, Rector of Tharfield, Master of Catherine Hall, Dean of Chichester, and Prebendary of Chichester, Prebendary of St. Pauls, and now Prebendary of Norwich. It highly concerns you to secure the Church, against such as would spoil you of your Goods.

But after all, you do not quarrel with his Lordship about these Negative Discouragements, but the Conclusion is, *That his Lordship does not allow the Magistrate to give any Encouragement to true Religion, or even Negative Discouragements to the contrary,* p. 20. This you observe from this Passage of his Lordship's Sermon. 'Tis not Sir, his Lordship, but our Saviour that is concern'd in this Passage. The Bishop is telling you what our Saviour thought. *Our Saviour was far from thinking that These, viz. Prisons, Banishments, Fines, Negative Discouragements, could be the Instruments of such a Persuasion, as he thought acceptable to God.* If you say then in Opposition to this, that Fines, Imprisonments, &c. are *Instruments of Persuasion,* you

you will oppose the Bishops Observation, but then you'll oppose our Saviours Judgment too : Or if you prove that the Sanctions of Christ's Laws are the Rewards and Penalties of *This* World, you'll destroy the Assertion in the Sermon. But your Observation as it lies, is just as pertinent, to borrow a Similitude from you, as if you had proved *there is no Philosophers Stone*, p. 54. But 2dly, What do you call *true Religion*, and to which you are *for giving any Encouragement by the Magistrate*. Is it that which the Magistrate *believes* to be *true*; Or that which *You* believe to be *true*? Or is not Encouragement to be *given* till he knows which is *the true One*? Or are ALL Magistrates of the *true Religion*? His Lordship meddles not with These Points: But from you Sir, who have, will be expected a plain Answer; and that will lead us into Enquiries how unjustly you charge his Lordship in your Observation.

The next and only Passage more which you examine of his Lordship's Sermon, is This. *As soon as ever you hear of any of the Engines of this World, whether of the greater or of the lesser sort, you must immediately think that then, and so far, the Kingdom of this World takes Place. For I. if the very Essence of God's Worship be Spirit and Truth. II. If Religion be Vertue and Charity, under the Belief of a Supreme Governor and Judge. III. If true real Faith cannot be the Effect of Force; IV. And*

if there can be no Reward, where there is no willing Choice : Then IN ALL, or ANY of these Cases to apply Force or Flattery, worldly Pleasure or Pain, is to act contrary to the Interest of true Religion, as it is plainly opposite to the Maxims upon which Christ founded his Kingdom ; who chose the Motives which are not of this World, to support a Kingdom which is not of this World, p. 21.

Your Observations upon this are, That his Lordship does and must maintain that in all the Cases mentioned, 'tis unlawful, 'tis wicked, to apply Temporal Rewards and Punishments, p. 22. That the Committee fixed on the two first Cases only.

Of the Two Cases, the First, you grant, supposes the Worship of God to be Spirit and Truth. Now his Lordship says, to apply Force or Flattery, worldly Pleasure or Pain, is contrary to the Interest of true Religion. To what End, and for what in this Case is Force or Flattery to be applied ? Is it to make Men Worship God in Spirit and in Truth ? Yes, or else you do not oppose his Lordship. But is it possible now for Force or Flattery to attain this End ? Will They or either of them make Men Sincerely Devout ? Will they touch the Heart, and make Men really and inwardly Worship God ? Or is worldly Pleasure and Pain, an Instrument of Perswasion ?

The Second of these Cases, you grant too, p. 22. supposes Religion to be Virtue and Charity
(real

(real not pretended) *under the Belief of a Supreme Governor and Judge.* Again, I ask, To what *End*, and for what in this Case is Force or Flattery to be apply'd? Is it to make Men *truly* Virtuous and Charitable, and to have a *real firm* Belief of a Supream Governour and Judge? But how can *Force* or *Flattery* make Men *truly* Virtuous and *truly* Charitable, and produce *real Faith* in Men? Or do they not tend directly to make Men *Hypocrites*; and in consequence, do not they who use them in either of the beforemention'd Cases, act contrary to the Interest of *True Religion*? Remember, Sir, your own Assertion, which I am obliged to put you in mind of; *The Church has no Right to impose Penal Laws upon any Account; In Matters of purely a Religious Nature, the State has no Right neither.* Sermon, p. 12. And let me use your own manner of Reasoning in this *Answer*, p. 25. *If you should say that The Worship of God, in Spirit and in Truth, And, Virtue and Charity under the Belief of a Supreme Governour and Judge, are not Matters of purely a Religious Nature, I should be surpriz'd: If you allow that they are, then the Consequencce is very plain, that you your self are against applying Rewards and Punishments to Religion and the Worship of God.*

But you have a remarkable Solution to this Question, To what End are Rewards and Punishments applied, p. 23. *Not to create, you say, a Persuasion, but meerly towards making Men do, what they know they ought*

to do. To This I reply, First. Does the Magistrate's Power extend to *All Cases, to make Men do what they know they ought to do?* e. g. Does it extend to *make* men Fear God and Love him with all their Hearts? Does it extend to *make* a Christian Love his Enemies? Does it extend to *make* a Man wish for Heaven? Does it extend to make Men be as *Nathanael* is describ'd, *an Israelite indeed in whom is no Guile?* Numberless are the Instances which may be given, in which the Magistrate has no Right to *make* Men do what they know they ought to do: And yet This is made the End of his Rewards and Punishments! 2dly, In what Sense do you your self say that the State has no Right to impose Penal Laws in Matters of purely a Religious Nature? Are not Matters of purely a Religious Nature, such Matters as Men know they ought to do? If they are, the Magistrate has a Right, you tell us here, to apply his Rewards and Punishments. If they are *not* such Matters as Men know they ought to do, then they are *not* Matters of purely a Religious Nature. 3dly, The End of Rewards and Punishments is to *make* Men do what they know they ought to do. You tell us, p. 29. *Conscience is not to be forc'd, but that Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions.* Well, the Men, suppose, have followed the best Light, and have chose: And now they know what They ought to do. Here then Re-
wards

wards and Punishments come in, and the Magistrate's Authority is in its proper Sphere. He is therefore to use his Authority ; for what ? To make Men do what they *know* they ought to do ; i. e. to *make* Dissenters *do* what they, by chusing their Opinions in the best Manner they can, *know* they ought to do, i. e. *saparate* from the Church : To make Anabaptists, Independents, &c. all *saparate* and continue *Separatists*, by Rewards and Punishments.

Whilst in my Letter to you I was speaking of this Passage of his Lordship's Sermon, and proving that you *agreed* with him in the same Notions, I us'd these Words, p. 18. *His Lordship asserts that to apply Force or Flattery, worldly Pleasure or Pain, in order to make Men profess this or that Opinion, (for this is evidently his Meaning) is to act, &c.* This Account you confute, p. 18. 19. by saying, that this *Evasion* is not applicable to the Passage you were considering in the 18th and preceding Pages. I have observ'd already your Justice in *applying* it to *another* Passage, which I never applied it to. Here, as in its proper Place, I shall consider your Answer. His Lordship, you say, p. 19. *does not speak of Civil Sanctions, as they may be applied to make Men Subjects of Christ, but only as they are an Increase of the Rewards and Punishments of those who are already Subjects to Christ, i. e. as they are calculated not to force a doubtful Opinion, or a Religion*

Religion not yet professed, but as they are intended to secure Obedience to a plain Law already receiv'd. 'Tis agreed his Lordship is speaking of such as are already Christians, yet are there no Rewards and Penalties amongst Men that are already Christians, to make them profess this, or that Opinion? If there be Rewards and Penalties, to make Christians profess Opinions, then my Account was plain, and easy: And that his Lordship had regard to such Proceedings is as plain; especially if you had considered the very next Paragraph of the Sermon, If these, viz. worldly Honours, &c. Prisons, &c. can be the true Supports of a Kingdom which is not of this World, then Sincerity and Hypocrisy,—Force and Perswasion, a willing Choice, and a terrified Heart, are become the same things, &c.

I am now to return you my Thanks for taking so much Pains upon my Account, and for entering so far into the Consequences of his Lordship's Doctrine, for the Consolation of the Letter-writer, p. 24. I acknowledge, Sir, that I did say, 'twas One of the most strange and surprizing Consequences that ever was drawn, to charge this Position of his Lordship, with setting the Worship of God and the Neglect of it, Religion and Irreligion, on an equal Foot in this World. Nor have I seen after all your Pains, that Consequence proved. The Consolation, I guess, lies in these Words, Dear Sir, don't be frightened, the Matter shall be made easy to you,
the

the Consequence shall be brought home to your door, without any Trouble to you. How is the Consequence proved ? His Lordship affirms, p. 24—25. *If the Essence of God's Worship be Spirit and Truth ; if Religion be Vertue and Charity, &c. In these Cases to apply Force or Flattery, (i. e. Rewards or Punishments) is to act contrary to the Interests of true Religion.*—Rewards and Punishments then are not to be applied *in these Cases*. Well, 'tis granted they are not to be applied, to *make Men Worship God in Spirit and Truth, or to make Men truly Virtuous*. If they are taken away in *these Cases*, what then ? Why, *since the Rewards and Punishments of this World are not to be applied to the Worship of God and Religion, ibid.* (you intend, I hope, to say *in these Cases*, to *make Men worship God in Spirit and in Truth, and to make Men really Virtuous,*) then *the Worship of God and the Neglect of it are set upon an equal Foot in this World*. The Consequence still is faulty. Nay, I'll venture so far upon the *Consolation* you have given me, as to tell you, 'tis my Opinion, that with all the Art you have, you cannot make that Consequence good. For tho' 'tis impossible to apply Rewards and Punishments to make Men *Worship in Spirit and in Truth*, in which the Essence of Religion consists, yet you yourself must own that Vice may be punished by the Magistrate, and consequently Religion

ligion and Irreligion, Virtue and Vice, will not be upon an *equal* Foot in this World.

When you had prov'd in your Way what you desired might be understood to be his Lordships Doctrine, you comprehend it in these three Articles, p. 25---26.

First, *He affirms it to be an Invasion of Christ's Kingdom for any Power on Earth to add Temporal Rewards and Punishments to Christ's Laws.* You should here in Justice add, what on this Head you charge his Lordship with, that the Magistrate for that Reason could not *add Sanctions to the Laws of Reason and Nature*, p. 6. But this had been too gross a Charge. I have shewn already that 'tis impossible for any one to *add Temporal Rewards and Punishments* to the *Laws* of Christ, strictly speaking, Because the *Laws* of Christ affect the Heart and Mind, the *inward Thought* as well as the *outward Action*. But then 'tis very consistent with Reason to have a Right to *reward* Virtue, and what *appears* as such, and to *punish* Vice ; and not to have a Right strictly to *add Sanctions* to the *Laws* of Christ, altho' Virtues and Vices have the Sanctions of Christ's Laws annexed to them. Every Magistrate has a Right to *reward virtuous Actions*, be he Christian or Heathen ; but he that will take upon himself to *add Sanctions* to the *Laws* of Christ, must take upon himself to be a *Discerner of the Thoughts and Intentions of the Heart*.

Secondly,

Secondly, He affirms, that 'tis contrary to the *Maxims of Christ to encourage the true Worship of God and true Religion, or to discourage the contrary, by the Sanctions of this World.* To this I say, you have not proved any such Consequence upon his Doctrines. Again, I say, whatever his Lordship has said, you have said as much. For you say, *The Kingdom of Christ is not of this World, nor is it to be erected or supported by Worldly Power, Sermon. p. 7.* From hence I infer thus: If the Kingdom of Christ is not to be supported by Worldly Power, then the *true Worship of God* is not to be supported by Worldly Power, i. e. by the Sanctions of this World. From both these you make by way of Inference a

Third Affirmation for his Lordship: That 'tis impious and wicked for any Prince to interpose his Authority to support true Religion, and the Honour of God in the World. Be this Consequence good or bad, which you please, his Lordship is in good Company, I mean with you: For you have told us, *that the Kingdom of Christ is not of this World, nor is it to be erected or supported by Worldly Power.*

But because his Lordship has met with such hard Usage for what he has taught upon this Subject, give me Leave to transcribe a little from Dr. Barrow's Tract of the *Unity of the Church*, what is conceived to be exactly parallel to his Lordship's Doctrines. "Our Saviour affirmed that his *Kingdom is not of this*
H " *World*

“ *World*---It disavoweth and discountenanceth
 “ the Elements of the World, by which *World-*
 “ *ly Designs* are carried on, and *Worldly Frames*
 “ sustained. It requireth not to be managed
 “ by politick Artifices or fleshly Wisdom, but
 “ by Simplicity, Sincerity, Plain-dealing—It
 “ needeth not to be *supported* or *enlarged* by
 “ *Wealth* and *Pomp*, or by *compulsive Force*
 “ and *Violence*—. It discountenanceth the
 “ *Imposition* of *New Laws* and *Precepts*, beside
 “ those which God hath joined, or which
 “ are necessary for Order and Edification,
 “ derogating from the Liberty of Christians,
 “ and the Simplicity of our Religion. The
 “ Government of the Christian State is repre-
 “ sented purely Spiritual, administred by meek
 “ Persuasion, not by *imperious Ave*, as an
 “ humble Ministry, not as *stately Domination*;
 “ for the Apostles themselves did not *lord over*
 “ *Mens Faith*, but did *co-operate to their Joy*;
 “ they did not *preach themselves*, but *Christ*
 “ *Jesus to be our Lord*, and themselves their
 “ *Servants for Jesus*, &c. But supposing the
 “ Church was designed to be one in this
 “ manner of Political Regiment (*viz.* so as
 “ a Kingdom under the Command of one
 “ Monarch) &c. its Majesty must be *supported*
 “ by *conspicuous Pomp* and *Phantastry*; its
 “ *Dignity* and *Power* must be *supported* by
 “ *Wealth*—it must exert *Authority* in ma-
 “ king *Laws*, &c. all which Things do much
 “ *disagree* from the Original Constitution and
 “ Design

“ Design of the Christian Church, which
 “ is *averse from Pomp*, doth *reject Domination*,
 “ doth *not require Craft, Wealth, or Force* to
 “ maintain it, but did at first, and may sub-
 “ sist without any such Means. I do not
 “ say that an Ecclesiastical Society may not
 “ lawfully, for its Support, *use Power; Po-*
 “ *licy, Wealth, in some measure to uphold*
 “ or defend it self; but that a Constitution
 “ needing such Things is Divine, or that
 “ SO FAR as it doth use them, it is no more
 “ than Human”. I leave this Passage as it
 lies in its Author to your Thoughts, and
 proceed,

Thirdly, To enquire into the Meaning of
 the particular Passages of your Sermon which
 I produced in my former Letter, in which
alone I charged you with an Agreement with
 his Lordship.

You do not come to this Point till you have
 spent 28 Pages in stating other Matters, which
 I have followed you in. P. 29. the Matter is
 stated thus *about the Magistrate's Power. Con-*
science in doubtful Cases ought not to be for-
ced, but that Men should be at Liberty to follow
the best Light they can get in chasing their Opini-
ons. On the other hand, *the Magistrate is to*
be secured from being insulted by Men who pretend
to act according to Conscience. Or as you have
 it p. 10. The Magistrate has *no Right to hurt*
Men for meer Opinions and Speculations in
Matters of Religion. Give me leave, Sir, to

join to this your frequent Declarations in this Book, p. 31, 37, 39, &c. *That the Church, as such, has no Temporal Power*, and I think it will follow, that the *Dean of Chichester* is as much against punishing *Heresy* with Fines, Banishments, Fire, moderate Penalties, as any Man can be. If *Heresy* be a *speculative Error* in Fundamentals, the Church has no Temporal Power, and the Magistrate has no Right to hurt Men, and consequently the Heretick is safe from Temporal Inconveniences in your own Opinion.

With those Principles in View you agree the 5th of Nov. Sermon was preached. Here the first great Difference betwixt his Lordship and you, p. 30. was, *He had no such Occasion, no such View to plead*: from whence you infer, *If our Words were the same, yet our Meaning was not*. Be, Sir, the Difference of the Occasion of the Two Sermons as great as you please, is not Truth the same every where, at Rome, and at Geneva, and at London? Doth it not hold good in all Cases and at all Times? Is it not the same when preached against *Papists*, and when against *Presbyterians*? Or is not the same Principle equally true when applied to one or to another? What is it to the Purpose to say that you expressly spoke of the Exercise of Temporal Power as used in the Church of Rome, and his Lordship as expressly of the Exercise of it in all possible Cases whatever? You make use of a general Principle, the very
same

same that his Lordship does. You apply it particularly; his Lordship doth *not* apply it particularly. Doth this affect the Principle it self, or make it less true when *universally* applied, or *different* from it self when *particularly* and when *universally* applied?

But this *Plea* is *quitted* by you p. 31. and you return to your Sermon, the first Head of which was to shew, you say, *that the Church, as such, has no Temporal Power.* The second Head is, *That the Argument does not affect the Civil Magistrate's Power, nor tie up his Hands from interposing in Matters proper for his Jurisdiction, however they may be pretended to be allied to Religion.* What now are Matters *improper* for his Jurisdiction? This you answer, p. 32. *Points of Conscience, residing in the Mind (in which Case, you say, you call them Matters purely of Religious Nature) where the Magistrate ought not to touch them.* What are Matters *proper* for his Jurisdiction? *Points of Conscience, you say, breaking out into ill Practices, which the Magistrate may lawfully punish.* These Foundations being laid down, you insist upon what? That you speak throughout the Sermon not of *pure Religion*, but *Pretences of Religion*, p. 33. of *Mens Opinions, Mistakes in their Judgments, and Errors of their Conscience*, p. 34. not of the *Laws of Christ*. Nay, you produce a Passage out of your Sermon on purpose to *clear this Point, and to shew on*
what

what Subject you was treating, whether the Laws of Christ and pure Religion, or doubtful Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Faith.

But, Sir, is *This*, and *This only*, what you spoke of in your Sermon? Or is not the very *first* Sentence I cited out of your Sermon a Confutation of all this Blind? Read it your self, p. 8. *'Tis just Reasoning, I think, to infer from the Spiritual Nature of Christ's Kingdom, and the Spiritual Power of his Ministers on Earth, that Temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the LAWS and EDICTS of Christ's Kingdom. For since the Kingdom is not of this World, the Powers belonging to THIS Kingdom cannot be of this World.* Do you here speak of the LAWS of Christ, or only of Pretences of Religion? Or what must the Reader understand by the LAWS and EDICTS of Christ? 2dly, Do not you examine this Pretence, p. 7. of the Sermon, *that there is room for the Exercise of Temporal Punishments in the Case of Religion, since some Punishments may be subser-vient to the End of Religion, and may help to set forward the Salvation of Men?* And do not you answer this in the following Paragraph? Can you mean in all this, when you speak of the *Salvation of Men* and the *End of Religion* as the same thing, only Pretences of Religion, Mistakes in Judgment, and such like? 3dly, What doth that other Passage mean cited by me, p. 12. of the Letter. *In Matters purely* of

of a Religious Nature *the State has no Right* neither. Can this be construed to mean, in doubtful Opinions, Mistakes, Errors, Pretences of Religion?

However, Sir, as you are at Liberty to use your own Terms in your own Sense, let us apply the Definition instead of the Term defined, and see how your Assertions stand then. You say you do *not speak of the Laws of Christ*, but of *Pretences of Religion, Mens Opinions, and Errors*, p. 33, 34. Take the Passages just now cited, if you please, in this Sense, and let those Words LAWS and EDICTS of Christ signify the Pretences of Religion; *Matters of purely a Religious Nature* signify doubtful Opinions, Mistakes in Judgment, and judge what mighty Matters you will gain. I'll grant you'll not agree with his Lordship then, and let me add, nor with common Sense.

You next oppose to his Lordship's Assertion, that ----- *all the Subjects of Christ are equally without Authority to judge, censure, or punish the Servants of another Master in Matters relating purely to Conscience or Salvation.* This Passage out of your Sermon, *The Arguments drawn from the Nature of Religion*, (I will not here put you in mind of Pretences of Religion) and of *Christ's Spiritual Kingdom against the Use of Temporal Punishments*, are conclusive ONLY as to the Ministers of that Kingdom, and cannot extend to the Civil Magistrate.

And

And this to shew what a *hopeful Way* of Agreement you are in, p. 34. If you oppose this to the Bishop, then you must assert, that *the Civil Magistrate has Authority to judge, censure, and punish Men in Matters relating purely to Conscience or Salvation.* Reconcile your self, if you can, here to the Passage you your self cited out of p. 11. of your Sermon, p. 33. of this Answer. As to mere Difference in Opinion, which ends only in Speculation, O R influences only the internal Acts of the Mind, O R produces only such external Acts as no way concern the Publick Peace, I see not how the Magistrate can interest himself in them. If Matters relating to Conscience or Salvation do not concern the Publick Peace in any external Acts which such Matters produce, you own the Magistrate cannot interest himself in them; and yet for fear of too nigh Approaches to his Lordship, you affirm the Magistrate may judge, censure, and punish in those very Instances.

You draw up the Particulars in which you differ from his Lordship, p. 36. thus: *The Bishop says, the Civil Magistrate has no Authority to add Temporal Punishments in Matters of Religion. I say, the Church has no Authority to add them.* Let me add to this the Passage last mentioned about the Magistrate, or that other, *As Matters of purely a Religious Nature the State has no Right neither,* Sermon. p. 12. or what occurs in this Answer, p. 6.

6. *The Magistrate has no Right to hurt Men for mere Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Religion.* Or what I have cited often from p. 29. Add These, and judge how much you differ from his Lordship. 2dly, *His Lordship speaks of the Laws of Christ as he left them: I speak of Differences in Opinions, of Matters of Speculation, of Mistakes and Errors of Conscience.* Let me add here to, that you speak expressly of *the LAWS and Edicts of Christ*, and of *pure Religion*, for you speak of *such Religion as procures the Salvation of Men.* 3dly, *His Lordship speaks of increasing the Penalties to make those obey the Law who are already Subjects of Christ, that is, who are willingly and sincerely persuaded of the Law: I speak of forcing the Assent in Matters of Difference.* When This is made intelligible, we shall judge whether you agree with or differ from his Lordship. For what if Men are *already Subjects of Christ*, and are *willingly and sincerely persuaded of the Law of Christ*, i. e. satisfied that Christ is their King and Lawgiver, and that the New Testament is his Law, yet may they not *differ* about the Meaning of several Particulars in it? Do not you speak of *Many Points upon which Churches have divided?* And were not these *Churches already Subjects of Christ?* And doth not his Lordship speak of *forcing the Assent in Matters of Difference* as well as you? Whether you agree with his Lordship or no, here I cannot

I say,

say, beccuse I do not understand what you aim at. Your Last Difference is, *His Lordship is against Negative Discouragements, I am against Positive Punishments.* And yet it seems we are both of the same Mind. Ought you not to have put it, his Lordship is against *Positive Punishments*? Or is his Declarations against *Fines, Prisons, &c.* not to be regarded? But suppose you differ from his Lordship about the Point of *Negative Discouragements*, was *That* the Charge in the *Letter* to you? Or is it ever mentioned? You do agree with his Lordship in what I charged an Agreement upon You; and at last you mention a Point *not* charged, in which it seems you say, you do *not* agree. I will not enquire whether *Negative Discouragements* purely on Account of Religion are not *real Punishments*; whether they are not *designed* as such to the Persons who have the Misfortune to lie under them; or whether They are not deprived of a *natural Right* by them; and whether the Loss of a *Natural Right* by a *Positive Law*, be not a *Positive Punishment*. Your Locks and Bolts, p. 20. are not designed to deprive Men of what they *have* an *equal, natural Right* too; but to keep Men from taking what they have *no Right* to. But as the Dispute between us is not what you said elsewhere, but what is in your Sermon, I'll consider the New invented Turn which you have offered to the World, in the same Order as the Passages were produced.

The First Passage is p. 8. *Serm.* in the *Lett.*, p. 11. 'Tis just Reasoning, I think, to infer from the *Spiritual Nature of Christ's Kingdom*, and the *Spiritual Power of His Ministers on Earth*, that temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the LAWS and EDICTS of Christ's Kingdom; for since the Kingdom is not of this World, the Powers belonging to this Kingdom cannot be of this World. Your Comment upon it is p. 37. This Passage stands under the First Head, which was to shew, That the Church, as such, is not entitled to the Exercise of Temporal Powers; and the very Passage it self speaks as much, concluding, that the Powers belonging to this Kingdom, (*i. e.* the Powers of the Church) cannot be of this World.

The use I made of this Passage was p. 13. of the *Lett.* His Lordship has said, If any Men have a right to add to the Sanctions of Christ's Laws; They SO FAR reign in their own Kingdom, not in his. You say, Temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the LAWS (add, and Edicts) of Christ's Kingdom, And, the Powers belonging to this Kingdom cannot be of this World. Your Answer to this is, that the Powers of the Church cannot be of this World. But, Sir, you infer from the *Spiritual Nature of Christ's Kingdom*, that Temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the Laws of Christ; And is the Consequence of this, that only the Church cannot exercise

I 2

them?

them? You say positively, *Temporal Punishments* are not *proper*, and then you conclude, what? That they are **PROPER** in the *Magistrate's* hands, tho' not in the *Church's*. You assert that the *Church* is not entitled to the *Exercise of Temporal Powers*. How is this proved? Why, from the *Impropriety* of Temporal Punishments, to enforce the **Laws** of Christ. Is this Reason good or not? If Temporal Punishments are *not proper* in themselves, as is inferr'd from the *Spiritual Nature* of Christ's Kingdom, then they must be equally *not proper* in the Hands of Church or State. Again, *Since the Kingdom is not of this World, the Powers belonging to this Kingdom cannot be of this World.* i. e. the *Powers of the Church* cannot be &c. Be it so. The *Powers* of the Church cannot be of this World. Why? Because they belong to a Kingdom not of this World, and for that Reason must be *only such* as are *proper* to enforce the **LAWS** of a Kingdom not of this World, which *Temporal Punishments* are not. The Magistrate therefore cannot use them to enforce the **LAWS** of Christ, unless he has a Right to use *improper Means*. But then This is the *very Reason* for which the *Church* is debarr'd those Means. I still therefore insist upon it, that by your declaring Temporal Powers to be *not proper* to enforce the **Laws** of Christ, you agree with his Lordship in saying, No Man has a *Right to add to the Sanctions of Christ's Laws*, but if

if they do add, SO FAR they reign in their *own* Kingdom.

The 2d Passage is, *Lett. p. 12. Serm. p. 8. If the Authority be of this World, it must be supported by the Power of this World.* To this in your *Answer* you have join'd the 7th Passage, but That I'll take in it's Course. You complain that you *cannot imagine to what Purpose these Passages are quoted*, p. 37. 'Twas for This. If this Consequence be good, *If the Authority be of this World, it must be supported by the Power of this World*, then I say that This Consequence is good too, *if the Authority be not of this World, it must not be supported by the Power of this World.* This is what you asserted in the 1st Passage, *since the Kingdom is not of This World, it must not be supported by the Powers of this World.* I own, Sir, you had a great deal of Reason to ask for what *Purpose this Passage was quoted*; I find I made no particular use of it in my *Letter*. The use of it ought to have been this. His Lordship says, *The Sanctions of Christ's Laws are—Not the Rewards of this World, not the Offices or Glories of this State, not the Pains of Prisons, &c.* You say, *If the Authority be of this World, it must be supported by the Power of this World.* The Offices and Glories of this State, are of this World, and therefore must be supported by the Power of this World; the Kingdom of Christ is not
of

of this World, therefore must not be supported by the Powers of this World.

Your Comment upon the Passage is, *That 'tis part of an Argument brought to assert the Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Church—against such as assert it to be a mere Creature of the State.* Let it be brought for what End you please: Is it not an *Universal Proposition*? And will an *Universal Proposition* hold good only in *Particular Cases*? Have not you made this Principle, a *Foundation* upon which you reason against such as you were concern'd with? Is it not a Principle from which you have drawn *Consequences*? I grant you, you *apply* it as you say you do. But then you make use of it as a *general Rule*, which comprehends in it several *Particulars*: And 'tis your *Principle* in which I charge you here with an Agreement with his Lordship, and not your *Consequences*. Your Inference shall be considered when I come to *Numb. 7.*

The 3^d, Passage is. *My Kingdom is not of this World.* This may serve to shew the Meaning and Extent of our Saviour's Argument, and how contrary it is to the Genius and Spirit of the Christian Religion to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments. The Powers which are derived to the Church from Christ, the Head of it, are purely Spiritual; the Punishments she inflicts are of the same Nature, and the effect of them is generally suspended till the Offender comes to another World.

Here

Here you charge me, p. 39. with shewing *My Art and Sincerity at once.* A *New distinct Paragraph* in the Sermon, is begun with the Words, *This may serve &c.* And what is still worse, the former *Paragraph does not end with those Words,* *My Kingdom is not of this World, but with these,* *Now is my Kingdom not from hence.* I allow, Sir, your Accuracy to be extraordinary: I own my Carelessness; I ought to have said, *My Kingdom is not of this World; if my Kingdom were of this World, then would my Servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: But now is my Kingdom not from Hence. This may serve to shew, &c.* Were I dispos'd to cavil, 'twould be just as much to the purpose for me to say, that you too have not put at the End of the Verse, *Job. 18. 36.* which is Printed in your Sermon. Did I injure your Sense by omitting the latter part of the Verse? Did I distort it to any Purposes of my own? Nay, did I make any Use of either the Former or Latter part of the Verse? To what *End* then was this Cavil, unless to amuse the Reader, and to raise a Dust? The New Paragraph begins with, *This may serve to shew, &c.* What is the Meaning of *THIS*? Or has it not an immediate Connexion with what goes before? What is the Antecedent to this Relative? If you say the whole Paragraph, I am contented; for then not only those Words, *My Kingdom is of this World, &c.* but what I have quoted *Numb. 6.*

too belongs to the Word **THIS** : Which what it betters your Cause, or makes mine the worse, let the World judge.

The Use I made of this Passage in my *Letter* was this, *p. 13.* The Bishop says, *The Rewards and Punishments of Christ's Laws—are not the Rewards of this World, &c.* You say *'Tis contrary to the Genius and Spirit of the Christian Religion, to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments.* You reply, that *This Passage speaks only of the Powers derived to the Church, from Christ the Head, p. 39.* And *what has this to do in a debate about the Magistrate?* The World about us is to judge of that. You directly assert it *to be contrary to the Genius and Spirit of the Christian Religion, to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments.* These are the Words made Use of *by* yourself and *against* you. Say then, *'tis contrary to the Genius of the Christian Religion, when the Church makes Use of Temporal Punishments, but 'tis agreeable to the Spirit of it when the Magistrate does.* This is what you would say, if you could ; and you *must* say it, if you resolve to disagree with his Lordship in this Point. And on this Account it is you put that shrew'd Question, *Because the Church has no Temporal Power, will it follow that the Magistrate has none?* Yes, it will follow upon the Principle by your self laid down, which I'll leave with you in Form thus. Whatever is *contrary to the Genius and Spirit* of the Christian Religion,
on,

on, no Man, neither Church, nor State can have a Right to. But 'tis *contrary to the Genius and Spirit* of the Christian Religion, to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments. Therefore neither Church nor State can have a Right to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments.

The 4th Passage is *Serm. p. 12. Lett. p. 12. The Truth of the Matter lies in a very narrow Compass : The Church has no Right to impose Penal Laws upon any Account : In Matters purely of a Religious Nature the State has no Right neither.*

Your Answer to this Part of your Agreement consists in telling us, that by *Matters purely of a Religious Nature*, you mean *Opinions in Religious Matters consider'd only, as they affect the Consciences of Men* : that is, as in the the same Page you explain it, *Points of Conscience, whilst they are in their proper Seat the Heart of Man, which the Magistrate's Power neither can nor ought to follow, p. 41.* 'Twas I suppose with this View, that you gave us that strange Account of the Magistrate's Authority over Conscience, *p. 30. viz. the Magistrate has nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience to find the Errors of it.* You have a Right indeed to use your Words as you please, but 'tis but a poor Evasion to complain of Difficulties of your Mother-Tongue *p. 42.* when you can't find Words in *English*, to express what you have no Ideas of in your Mind. Is it to

be conceived that This is all you mean by, *The State has no Right to impose Penal Laws in Matters of purely a Religious Nature, viz. The State has no Right to punish a Man for Thinking in Matters of purely a Religious Nature?* To what End was it that you added those insignificant Words *in Matters of purely a Religious Nature?* If the State cannot punish a Man for *Thinking*, what signifies it, whether his Thoughts be upon Matters of a *Religious Nature*, or upon any thing else? 2dly, *The Church, you say, has no Right to impose Penal Laws in any Case, In Matters of purely a Religious Nature the State has no Right.* Are Matters of *Conscience and Salvation*, Matters of *purely a Religious Nature?* If they be, then as the Bishop denies the Right to alter the Nature of the Rewards or Punishments in such Cases, so do you here by denying a Right to *Church or State* to punish in such Cases. If Matters of *Conscience and Salvation* are *not* Matters of *purely a Religious Nature*, be so kind as to inform the World what are such. 3dly, Matters of purely a Religious Nature, are, according to you, Points of Conscience, *whilst* they are in their *proper Seat, the Heart of Man.* i. e. They are no more than *Ideas, Thoughts, Notions.* These, 'tis true the Magistrate's Power *neither can nor ought to follow.* What now is *pure Essential Religion?* Is it not, Those Thoughts produced into Actions? No doubt of it. Has the Magistrate then a *Right*

to impose Penal Laws in Cases of this sort of Actions? In the Passage produced by yourself out of your Sermon, (p. 33. Answer.) You assert, that Opinions *which produce only such external Acts, as no way concern the Publick Peace, the Magistrate cannot interest himself in them.* You yourself therefore allow that there are *External Acts, the Produce or Effect of Matters of purely a Religious Nature* in your Sense of those Words, which *the Magistrate cannot interest himself in;* and consequently your Exposition of this Passage, by which you would confine the *Right of the State,* to Points *within the Heart of Man* is but an Evasion. 4thly, to what *End* is it that *Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions,* as you tell us they are, p. 29. unless it be to regulate their Actions. 'Tis agreed by *us both,* that when Opinions *come to shew themselves in Practices of ill Consequence to Publick Peace,* the Magistrate has a Right to take Cognizance of them. You allow too, that where the *Publick Peace is no way concerned,* the Magistrate *cannot interest himself.* To the Question Now, to what *End* is it that *Men should be at Liberty to follow the best Light they can get in chusing their Opinions,* the Answer is, The more acceptably to God to govern their *Practices.* Are These *Practices* subject to Penal Laws? Yes, say you, if they are of *ill Consequence to Publick Peace.* But what if they are not of

ill Consequence to Publick Peace. The Magistrate, you say, cannot interest himself in them. Sermon. p. 11. And p. 12. it occurs again, in Matters purely of a Religious Nature, the State has no Right to impose Penal Laws. But let the Reader judge, if you do not in that Place, oppose Matters purely of a Religious Nature, in which you say, the Magistrate has no Right to impose Penal Laws, to Matters pretended to be of a Religious Nature, in which the Magistrate ought not to sit still. If so, you must look for another Interpretation of Matters of purely a Religious Nature, or agree with the Bishop of Bangor.

The 5th Passage is pretty long from p. 6. Sermon. Let. p. 15. The part of it made use of by me is, *The Argument reaches to ALL Methods of propagating Religion, which are hurtful and injurious to Men, as well as meerly to the destroying them by Fire and Sword; for the Son of Man no more came to injure and abuse Men, then he did to destroy them: And the Argument is equally strong against injuring or abusing our Fellow Creatures, in order to Propagate the Faith, as it is against destroying them.*

The Use I made of this, was Let. p. 19. You blame ALL such Methods of propagating Religion which are hurtful and injurious to Men; As the Bishop blames ALL such Motives as are inconsistent with a willing Choice. What is the Reply you make to shew you do not agree with

with his Lordship here? Why? *Propagating Religion is one thing: And punishing Men for Actions*, p. 44. *against the plain Laws of Christ, to which they own themselves subject, is another.* What is it you mean by, *to which they own themselves subject*? Do not all Christians own themselves subject to *all* the Laws of Christ? Or has any Man a Right to punish Christians for the breach of all the *plain Laws* of Christ? 'Tis a plain and exprefs Law of our Saviour, *Mat. 5. 28. I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a Woman to lust after her, hath committed Adultery with her already in his Heart.* Has the Church or State a Right to punish a Man for the Breach of this Law, *plain and clear* as it is? But whether they can do it, or not, what is this to your purpose, to prove your Disagreement with his Lordship? 2dly, When Men are punished in your way for the Breaches of plain Laws of Christ, is it not chiefly to make them *reform*? If this be the chief End of the Punishment, I wou'd ask, if this be not to *propagate Religion* your Way? And then I would ask again, how consistent this is with your *blaming ALL Methods* of propagating Religion which are *injurious or hurtful to Men*? And whether Punishment be not hurtful or injurious to Men? But your everlasting Resource is, that You are speaking of Church Power, *his Lordship of the Civil Magistrate.* p. 45. Do not you say, that the Argument reaches to *ALL methods* of propagating

gating Religion, &c? And yet this *ALL Methods*, is intended only to reach to the *particular* method of the *Church's* meddling with Temporal Power. Is not the Argument *equally strong*, by your own Confession, *against* injuring and abusing *our Fellow Creatures*, in order to propagate the Faith, as 'tis against destroying them? If it be, can only the *Church* injure and abuse our Fellow-Creatures? Or, is it *impossible* for the *State* to hurt them? If the *Church* extirpates Hereticks by Fire and Faggot, *i. e.* by Temporal Powers, is this *blameable* by the Proposition in dispute? Yes, because the *Church* has no Temporal Power. When a Heretick was convicted by the *Church*, and was deliver'd over to the *Secular Power* to be burnt; was this *Blameable* or no by *this Argument*, which reaches, you say, exactly to *ALL Methods* of propagating Religion which are *hurtful* or *injurious* to Men? No, this is not blameable by this Argument; for you was not speaking of the *Secular Power*. *Risum teneatis?* But still you have another Evasion, *p. 44.* The Bishop says, 'tis *opposite to the Maxims of Christ*, to encourage by Temporal Rewards Religion as 'tis *Virtue and Charity*, whereas You say, *That the Faith is not to be propagated by hurting or abusing Men*. But does not the Bishop talk of *Punishments* too, in the very place alledged, or ought you to have omitted That? 2dly, Is it Religion, that is performed *for the sake* of Temporal Rewards,

more

more than it is *Faith* that is propagated by *Injury* and *Abuse*? It is not *real Faith* in the one *Case*, nor *true Religion* in the other, but *Profession*, *external Declaration*, mere *Form* of *Godliness* but nothing of its *Powers*.

The 6th Passage is *Serm. p. 7. Let. p. 16. To those who urge the Conveniency of Temporal Punishments in Matters of Religion, we answer with our Blessed Saviour, ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of. The Kingdom of Christ is not of this World, nor is it to be erected or supported by worldly Power.*

Your Answer here is, *p. 45. If my Friend cannot see that I speak here of Church Power, not of Civil Power, I have no help for him. I charged you, Let. p. 18. with this Agreement, His Lordship says, "As soon as the Engines of this World take Place, then and so far the Kingdom of this World takes Place." And, "Christ chose the Motives which are not of this World, to support a Kingdom which is not of this World." You say, "The Kingdom of Christ is not of this World, nor is it to be erected or supported by Worldly Power." His Lordship asserts, "That to apply Force or Flattery, Worldly Pleasure or Pain," in order to make Men Profess this or that Opinion (for this is evidently his meaning) "is to act contrary to the Interests of true Religion." You say, "That to urge the Conveniency of Temporal Punishments in Matters of Religion, is not to*
" know

“ *know what manner of Spirit we are of.* ”
 Is your Answer satisfactory, or is it not a mere Evasion to say you are here speaking of *Church Power* only? Is it *Worldly Power* only when the *Church* makes use of it to *erect* or *support* the Kingdom of Christ, Or is it not equally *Worldly Power*, when the *State* uses it for the same Ends? Is not the *Spirit* of Christianity equally affected by *Temporal Punishments*, when One Man or Another applies them? Or will you say This, *The Kingdom of Christ* may be *erected and supported by Worldly Power*, and *Temporal Punishments*, when the Civil Magistrate uses them, but it *may not be erected or supported by Worldly Power and Temporal Punishments* in the Hands of the Church; And *Temporal Punishments* are convenient in *Matters of Religion* in the Hands of the *State*, but *not* in the Hands of the *Church*. If this be your Opinion in this 7th Page of your Sermon, I desire you would fairly reconcile it to the First Passage produced from p. 8. of the same Sermon, where you say, that *Temporal Punishments* are not proper to *inforce the LAWS and Edicts of Christ*. Not proper neither in the Hands of One nor Another.

The 7th Passage is an Inference from the 2d. Those who are for throwing all *Spiritual Power* out of the Church, and introducing into the Room of it a Power derived from the Civil Magistrate, must, to exempt the Consciences of Men, from a *Spiritual Jurisdiction*, submit
 them

them to a Temporal ; which is in its Consequence, whatever it may be in its Principle, Downright Popery. Ser. p. 8—9. Lett. p. 17.

The Question here is only, *What is downright Popery ?* Is it not such, *to submit the Consciences of Men to a Temporal Jurisdiction ?* Have you not here expressly said so ? 'Tis therefore nothing to the Purpose, to talk of the Connexion of this Passage as you do, *p. 38.* with what precedes, unless you deny that to be *downright Popery*, which I have charged you with asserting to be so in this Passage. 'Tis the *Principles* of your Sermon, Sir, and not the *Application* of them, which gave Occasion for the Letter to be wrote to you.

The Five next Passages are considered together by you *p. 46, 47, &c.* of your Answer ; They are all founded upon, or plain Assertions of this Principle, *The Magistrate has nothing to do with Conscience :* And you acknowledge that you *allow this Principle*, *p. 47.* But then you add, to divert your Reader I suppose, that notwithstanding this, *the Magistrate may punish the ill Actions of Men, however they may plead Conscience*, which the Bishop has proved as directly as you yourself have. But how do you allow this Principle ? If we look back to *p. 30. I.* You tell us 'tis in *This Sense* that the Magistrate has *nothing to do to examine Mens Conscience to FIND the Errors of it.* *P. 41, II,* it is explained further, the Magistrate's Power *neither can nor ought to follow Points*

of Conscience, *whilst they are in their proper Seat, the Heart of Man.* P. 31, III, You tell us, that in your Sermon, you *was against driving Men into doubtful or false Opinions in Opposition to the Light of their own Minds.* P. 10. IV. You tell us, you *so confined the Magistrate's Authority in the 5th of Nov. Sermon, as not to give him a Right to hurt Men for mere Opinions and Speculations in Matters of Religion.* P. 47. V. You say, that you *have shewn, that this Right (to punish the Evil Actions of Men arising from Conscience) is consistent with a'l just Claims that can be made in behalf of Conscience.* What Now is the Meaning of this Principle, allowed by you, *The Magistrate has nothing to do with Conscience.* Sometimes it is not to *drive Men into Opinions which they have not,* sometimes not to *hurt Men for Opinions which they have,* sometimes not to *search for Opinions which Men have, be they true or false,* and sometimes 'tis not to *search to Find the Errors only.* As these are your own Expositions of this Principle allowed by you, I wou'd ask you, in the Bishop's Words, *Ought the Frowns and Discouragements of this present State to attend upon Conscience and Religion?* Is it not your own avow'd Opinion, p. 10. that the Magistrate *ought not to hurt Men for mere Opinions?* Again. *Ought the Secular Arm to be call'd upon to inforce his Doctrine?* You assert, you are *against driving Men into Opinions,*

pinions, p. 31. Is not this agreeing with his Lordship, or do you think the World so blind as not to see thro' this thin Disguise, that truly you was speaking only of *Conscience as supposed erroneous and leading to evil Practices*. p. 47. But this puts me in Mind of your other Evasions, where ALL Methods of propagating Religion which are hurtful to Men, signifies *only* so in Cases of the *Church*: And, Temporal Punishments are *not proper* to enforce the *Laws* of Christ; you mean, not proper in the Church, &c. so here Conscience in *general* is an *Erroneous Conscience only*.

Thus, Sir, have I followed you through all the Passages at first cited from you. But because you disclaim an Agreement with the Bishop of *Bangor* in the *Principles* of that Sermon, give me Leave to put the Controversy in another Light. Do you disclaim this general Principle. I. *Temporal Punishments are not proper to enforce the Laws and Edicts of Christ* which is the Principle of the 1st Passage. If you do, then you must maintain, That *Temporal Punishments are proper to enforce the Laws and Edicts of Christ*. II. Do you disclaim *This* general Principle? v. 3^d Passage. *It is contrary to the Genius and Spirit of the Christian Religion to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments*. If you do, then you must maintain *This*, 'Tis agreeable to the Genius and Spirit of the Christian Religion to found its Faith in Temporal Punishments. III. Do

you disclaim this general Principle? v. 4th Passage. *The Church has no Right to impose Penal Laws on any Account, In Matters of purely a Religious Nature the State has no Right neither.* If you do, you must maintain, that *in Matters of purely a Religious Nature the State has a Right to impose Penal Laws.* And the Like of the Church too.

IV. Do you disclaim this Position? v. 5th Passage. *ALL Methods of propagating Religion which are hurtful and injurious to Men, are inconsistent with the Honour of God and Religion.* If you do, you must maintain that, some *Methods of Propagating Religion which are hurtful to Men are consistent with the Honour of God and Religion.*

V. Do you disclaim This Principle? v. 6th Passage. *Temporal Punishments are not agreeable to the Spirit of Christianity* If you do, you must maintain that *they are agreeable.*

VI. Do you disclaim this, *ibid.* *The Kingdom of Christ is not to be erected or supported by Worldly Power.* If you do, you must assert, that *it is to be erected and supported, by Worldly Power,*

VII. and Lastly, Do you disclaim these Principles, *The Magistrate is not to debar Men the Liberty of following the best Light they can get in choosing their Opinions, nor is he to hurt them for Opinions which do not affect the State, nor is he to drive Men into Opinions?* If you do, you must maintain the Reverse of these.

The

The *Principles*, which I ask, if you do disclaim, are conceiv'd by Me and by many Others to be maintain'd in your Sermon, or else the Sermon is Nonsense, and you are conceiv'd to agree with the Lord Bishop of Bangor in *Them*; how unwilling soever you are to accept that Complement. p. 4.

I am obliged to return you My hearty Thanks for that publick Acknowledgment of yours, p. 54. that his Lordship Fights without an Adversary, whilst he contends against an absolute Authority to interpret the Laws of Christ, and impose Laws. Let but this be a Rule of Practice as well as Theory, and I persuade my self you'll find Reason to retract your Censure upon his Lordship, as something too near a Claim of Absolute Authority to interpret Scripture for, and impose it upon him; which since you thus publickly disclaim, I return you my Thanks, and beg leave again to subscribe my self,

Reverend Sir,

Your most Obliged humble Servant,

A. A. S Y K E S.

A N

APPENDIX

*Relating to a PASSAGE or Two
in Dr. Snape's Second Letter to the
Lord Bishop of Bangor.*

I Take the present Opportunity to vindicate my self, and Others, from a *Scandalous* and *Wicked* Imputation contain'd in p. 53. of Dr. *Snape's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*, in these Words. " I cannot have the Satisfaction of agreeing with your Lordship, without the unpleasant necessity of differing from every Body else, BUT the ENEMIES of all REVELATION, your Lordship's profess'd Admirers, and the ONLY SECONDS you have had in this Controversy."

I cannot but here call upon the Reverend Dr. *Snape* in this publick manner, in behalf of my self and several other Clergymen who have appeared as SECONDS, and do appear as such *in this Controversy*; and I do hereby call upon him to prove the Charge which he has thus
unjustly,

unjustly, wickedly and abusively published ; viz. that *the ONLY SECONDS* which the Lord Bishop of *Bangor* has had in *this Controversy* are *ENEMIES* to all *REVELATION*. I insist upon it that he make this *publicly* to appear. I call upon him, as he will answer it to God at the Day of Judgment, when the Secrets of all Hearts shall be open'd, to produce his Evidence for such his *vile and detestable* Imputation. If he doth not make good this Charge, which I aver he cannot do, or retract it, then I hereby give this *Publick Notice*, that no Man ought to give *more or greater Credit* to what the said *Dr. Snape* doth aver in Points of Fact, than is to be given to one who hath *publicly* and *notoriously* asserted the most abominable *Falshoods*, and when call'd upon to *justify* them, hath not, nor can justify them.— Thus far in Point of Fact.

The Other thing I design, is to examine the *56th* and *57th P's.* of the said *Letter*, The Doctor asserts, That *there could be no such Thing as Unity and Communion in the CHURCH, if no Man were to join himself to any Communion of Christians, till he had decisively settled his Personal Persuasion, as to every Point of the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship required in that Communion, without any Regard to the Authority that enjoins it. Let every Man, in Gods Name, examine his Religion—. But what must such a Man do in the mean Time ?— viz. during Examination. Must he live like*
an

an Heathen, out of the Communion of the Church? No certainly, but submit himself, for the Authority's sake, to the yet unexamined Decision of the Church.

To live like an Heathen, and out of Communion of the Church are the necessary Consequences of not submitting, according to Dr. Snape, to the yet unexamined Decisions of the Church. What are these UNEXAMINED Decisions of the Church, that are *blindly* to be submitted to in order not to live like an Heathen? What Decisions of Doctrines are there to be professed in Order to Communion, which Men are to receive *implicitly*, and *implicitly* to profess they believe? When a Person of *riper Years* is Baptized, ('tis the same Case of an *Infant* baptized, but brought to *Confirmation*) what is he baptized to? Are any other Doctrines of the Church required of him to believe or to submit to, or are they so much as *mentioned*, besides what are contained in the Apostles Creed? Those of Riper Years are always *instructed* in all that is necessary for a Christian Man to believe, *before* they are Baptized; and Infants Baptized, *before* they are confirmed; (This will help to determine that great Controversy about Fundamentals) and they are admitted to the *Communion* of the Church, upon this publick Testimony of their Belief of the Principles of Christianity. Are they *instructed* likewise, that they must submit to any *unexamined Decisions* of the Church? This is just as
if

if the Apostles should Baptize first into Christianity, and then examine if Men did believe. The *Rites and Ceremonies* of a Church they *may* submit to *unexamined*: Because Rites and Ceremonies being *indifferent* in themselves, and no ways *Parts of Religion*, Men may be allowed to be less solicitous about them. But to submit to Points of *Doctrine* and *Worship* implicitly, *for the Authority's sake, meerly such*, as Dr *Snape* tells us we must, or *live like Heathens*, is the very Essence of Popery. What is it but *Popery* to tell us that a Man *must submit himself*, for the Authority's sake, *to the yet unexamined Decisions of the Church*? Is not this to say, You must believe as the Church believes, and *implicitly* follow her Dictates? A Man must live either *out of the Communion of the Church*, or *submit to the unexamined Decisions of the Church*. *Implicit Submission* is therefore *necessary to Communion*, according to the Reverend Doctor: Which if it be not rooting up Protestantism, and implanting Popery, I leave every body but Dr *Snape*, who pleads for implicit Submission, to judge.

The Dr. puts a Case to confirm his Notion thus. *Suppose a Man should be unable, after the strictest Scrutiny to determine himself either way, if he thinks himself press'd by equal Reasons, to this and that Opinion;—the Authority of the Church, as such, ought in Conscience to determine him.—The Submission is to the Authority merely as such.*

M

To

To this I reply, First ; If a Man submits to a Doctrine which he has *equally Good* Reasons *against* his Submission as *for* it, 'tis evident he submits *without* any Reasons, and acts a foolish Part. I hope that no *Articles of Communion* are of this sort, that a Man can have *equal* Reasons *for* and *against* his Submission to Them ; If they be, they ought not to *continue* Articles of Communion. 2dly, This is the common Case of a *Doubting Conscience* ; which if St. *Paul* be of sufficient Authority, is determined in Cases of Practice, *Rom. 14. 23. Whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin* ; In Matters of Speculation 'tis as evident, that a Man ought to suspend his Assent either way. But 3dly, Why is any Man *obliged in Conscience* to submit implicitly to a *Doctrine* as an Article of Communion, which is not an Article of the Faith into which he was Baptized ? *Obliged in Conscience*, the Doctor says ; 'tis hoped he'll prove it too : But if he has kept within the *Bounds of CHRISTIAN Charity*, in his Letter to the Bishop of *Bangor*, p. 6. I desire He would consult the Rules of the *Heathen* Moralists, and follow them in his Reply to This, if he thinks fit to make any.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT.

*To the Reverend Dr. Sherlock,
Dean of Chichester.*

S I R,

I Take this Opportunity, at the *End* of this *Second Letter*, of troubling You with some of my Thoughts, occasion'd by your *Late Answer*, to a *Former Letter* upon the same Subject.

I am very sorry to find that *Any Suspicion* of My having been the *Author*, or *Encourager* of that *Former Letter* to you, (of which I assure you, I knew no more than *yourself*, till some time after it was publish'd,) should have carried you, manifestly out of your way; and diverted you from the *Subject* of your own *Defence*, to bring *Me* and my *Future Defense*, into your *Debate*: and this, in a *Manner*, which lies too open to the *Observation* of the World, to need any Description of mine. However, I thank you for your *Directions*, in what *Sense* I am to understand my own Words; and in what manner I am

to behave my self in my *Future Defense*; as well as for your *Explications* of the *Intention* of the *Committee* in some *Passages* of the *Representation*, which otherwise neither I, nor the World, could possibly have discovered. This I look upon, as One Happiness arising from the *Delay* of my *Answer*; which, had it not been for a very great *Indisposition*, had long ago seen the *Light*: These *Directions* I promise you to follow, as far as my own Conscience, and Judgment will permit: As well as to regard Those *Explications*, as far as is consistent with the *declared Design*, and *Honour*, of the *Committee* itself.

I take leave, in the *first* place to observe One very *Great Mistake*, in your representing my Sense upon a very *important Subject*, when you lay it upon me, *That I write down the Magistrate's Power in All Cases*; p. 30. and give it as my Sentiment, that the *World must be torn to pieces, without Remedy*; and that the *Magistrate* is not to concern Himself with the *Practice*, i. e. the *outward Practice of Virtue*, p. 24 because the same Action is a *Law of Christ*, guarded by *His Sanctions*. These are very heavy Charges. I need not affirm that No such Thought ever enter'd into my Heart. I have, upon many Occasions, asserted the contrary to what is here laid upon me. I am ready to prove that I have not used a *single Expression* tending this Way: And that One natural Consequence from the whole

whole *Tenour* of my *Sermon* it self, is, that it is the True, and proper Business of the *Magistrate*, to concern Himself with the *Outward Practice* of *Virtue*, and of every thing which directly affects the happiness of *Society*. I was the more surpriz'd at this *Charge* from you; because, in your own *Sermon*, p.8. you make it an *Inference*; and, what is very remarkable, just as I do, from the *Spiritual Nature* of the *Kingdom* of *Christ*, (and not only from the *Spiritual Nature* of His *Ministers*.) that *Temporal Punishments* are NOT PROPER to enforce the LAWS and Edicts of *Christ's Kingdom*. Now, if *Temporal Punishments* be not proper to enforce *Christ's Laws*, because His *Kingdom* is of a *Spiritual Nature*; I'm sure, this *Argument* excludes *Temporal Punishments*, with respect to *Christ's Laws*, from All Hands equally, and totally. If any one had inferr'd from hence, that you had writ down the *Magistrate's Power* in All Cases, under the Cover of writing against *Temporal Power* in the *Church*; I would have been so far from joining in the *Charge*, that I would absolutely have denied it. I think it is plain that this is so far from banishing *Temporal Sanctions* out of the *Magistrate's Kingdom*, that it is confining them to His own *Kingdom*, and only throwing them out of *Christ's*: That the very same individual *Outward Action*, whether practis'd upon the meanest Principle of *Humane Life*, or upon the

the *best*, is equally the *Object* of the *Magistrate's* care, as it equally affects *Society*; but that this same good *Action*, or outward practice of *Virtue*, is not *Religion*; not a *Law* of *Christ* nor an *Edict* of *His Kingdom*, any otherwise, than as it is practis'd upon a Principle of *Religion*; and upon the *Inward Sincere Belief* of a Judgment to come. Of this the *Magistrate* is not Judge. His *Sanctions*, therefore, consider'd as a *Magistrate*, are no more than the *Sanctions* of *Humane*, and *Social Laws*: Not the *Sanctions* of *Christ's* Laws, or of the *Edicts* of *Christ's Kingdom*; any more than the *Sanctions* of the *Roman Magistrate* were, as they are described by *St. Paul*, *Rom. 13.* before the *Magistrate* knew any thing of *Christ*; nay, When He was an *Enemy* to the *Laws* and *Edicts* of *Christ's Kingdom*.

I will beg leave to give *one Instance*: And that of *Charity*, because you have mention'd it. The *Outward Action* of distributing *Money*, or *Necessaries*, which may supply the Wants of Others, let it be upon what Principle it will, goes under the *general Name* of *Coarity*. Suppose the *Magistrate* to enact by a Law, some public *Honour*, or *Advantage*, to All who thus distribute to Others; and some *Disgrace*, or *Disadvantage* to All, who do not. This, I say, is only annexing *Sanctions* to an *Outward Practice*, good and beneficial to *Humane Society*, let it be founded upon what Motive,

Motive, it will. It is no more adding *Sanctions* to *Christ's Laws*, than to *Mahomet's*. This same *Outward Practice*, when it is upon a Principle of Vain-glory, or any Worldly Motive, is so far from being *Christ's Law*, that it is particularly disown'd by Him, in the *Gospel*: And yet it is the *Law of Men*, as it is the same *Material Action*, useful to Society. But it is *Religion*, and *Christ's Law*, solely as it is practis'd upon a *Principle of Religion*, and a *Sense of Duty*. And the *Magistrate* in adding *Sanctions* to it, doth not add *Sanctions* to a *Law of Christ*, but to a *Law of Men*. To represent me, therefore, as saying that the *Magistrate* hath no Obligation to reward the *Outward Practice* of what is good for *Humane Society*, or to punish the contrary; because this same *Outward Practice*, is entitled to the *Rewards* promis'd by *Christ*, in a future State; and the contrary, to future Punishments: Such a *Representation*, I say, of my Sense, p. 24. cannot be approved of by you, upon second thoughts: because it is so far from being any Reasoning of mine; that this follows from *Christ's* having annex'd *Rewards and Punishments* hereafter to the *Outward Practice* &c, that I maintain the very contrary; viz. That *Christ* hath annex'd *No Rewards* to that *Outward Practice*, to which alone *Civil Authority* can reach; but to *Outward Practice* conducted by inward Sincerity of Belief, and the Motives of *Religion*.

gion. I was willing to take notice of this Great Misapprehension of my Sense, in this most important Point. I know You have *other Charges* against Me, or in *Other Words*, upon this same Subject: Which I promise You fully to consider in my *Future Defense*. At present, I shall say no more upon it, but only return You, your own *Syllogism*, in effect, in answer to it, as you apply it to Me, *p.* 17. being persuaded, the World will plainly see, it to be as *conclusive* against yourself, as against Me.

Temporal Punishments, You affirm, are *not proper* to enforce the *Laws* and *Edicts* of *Christ's Kingdom*.

But Many of the *Laws* and *Edicts* of *Christ's Kingdom*, as to the *Matter* of them, (for *so* only We can mean,) are *Laws* of Reason, and of great importance to Society.

Therefore, according to You, for the Magistrate to enforce by *Temporal Penalties*, these *Laws*, which yet are the *Laws* of Humane Society, is *not* at all *proper*; but indeed contrary to the *Spiritual Nature* of *Christ's Kingdom*. Give me leave here to add, that whenever, in the *sequel* of the *Debate*, I may find any other Occasion to consider Any of Your *Arguments*, whether in the form of a *Syllogism*, or out of it, I promise You neither to make merry with the *Manner*, nor the *Matter* of Them: but, whatever I think of *both*, to treat them as coming from a Person of Great Abilities and Weight; and *One*, whom I can
never

never persuade my self either to *contemn*, or to *ridicule*.

I do not at all doubt the *Truth* of what You say, p. 52. that *you could not have been silent*, in *Convocation*, upon this occasion, *if you would maintain the Trust reposed in you*. But I fear that *They*, who were, above All Others, the most *Inflexible* in making this a *Matter Personal*, upon *Me* by name, can hardly be the most desirous that I should acquit my self well of the *Charge* against me: Nor can it be naturally expected that *They* should be *ready amongst the foremost, to own, either Ignorance or Weakness*. p. 52. 62.

I am so unhappy as to differ from You in many lesser Points, in your *Answer*. Particularly, I must always think, that to make a matter as plain as an *Identical Proposition* (which was indeed all the occasion I gave for your *Mirth*, p. 12.) is so far from being One of the *last Pangs of a Dying Cause*, that it is the greatest sign of the contrary. And again, I think I see plainly, that a Person may maintain the *Maxims*, or *Motives*, of *this World*, to be contrary to Those *Motives* upon which *Christ's Religion* was founded by *Himself*, who knew best what was *contrary to its Interests*; without maintaining either that *Worldly Motives* always destroy *All True Religion*, or that it is *Impious and Wicked*, (as your Words are, p. 26.) in Any, to apply them, in *those Points*, I truly intended in my *Sermon*: As

N

shall

shall be farther explain'd hereafter. And I think this as plain, as it is, that I may maintain *Immense Riches* to be in their tendency, contrary to Virtue, without supposing either that They always actually destroy it ; or that it is *impious* and *wicked* for a Man to leave a *Great Estate* to his Son.

But, as to the *Main Point*, relating to the *Civil Power* ; and that *Point* which alone is said to have *determined* Some Persons, or to have given them a happy occasion to enter into the *Condemnation* of what I had preach'd ; I doubt not, Every one will see, more and more plainly every Day that We must be acquitted, or condemn'd together.

Your *Concessions*, in the other *Main Point*, relating to *Church-Authority*, and your *Declaration* that, as I explain my self I *fight without an Auversary*, (p. 54.) I esteem a *Reward*, worthy of All the Labour, and All the Reproach, I have undergone in this Affair. But *one* thing I must declare, (because I think the *Imputation* a *Dishonour*,) that I never was so mean-spirited as to pretend that I intended All I have said, against The *Church of Rome* only, or had *only published a Doctrine against Popery, in which All agree* : As You seem to lay it upon me, with the pleasantry of a little *Ricicule*. I said indeed, that I *knew of No Church except the Church of Rome, which ever dared to claim such an Absolute Authority*. But I have declared, long ago, openly, that I
mean't

mean't what I have said to conclude, (as it must do, whether I mean't it, or no,) against *All Persons in All Churches* who carry on the *same Claim*, whilst They disown it in Words; who assume, upon all proper Occasions, an *Authority* equally *Indisputable*, tho' not *Infal-
lible*; who in *fact*, take from *Inferiors* the *Right* of Judging for Themselves in Religion, or the *Right* of declaring their Judgment; and who are constantly and violently displeased with *Any*, who inculcate upon the *People* what They themselves cannot deny to be true, but would willingly have to be inviolably kept a *Secret*. If there be no such Persons, I am as glad, as *Any Man* living. I'm sure, I have as much reason to rejoice, as *Any One*; and to wish, *it had been sooner true*. They who who tax me with a *Secret*, in *that Sermon*, p. 61. must have full as mean an Opinion of my *Abilities*, as of my *Honesty*, if they consider the *Openness* of the *Sermon*, and what I have said, since, in publick, upon that Occasion.

As for *justifying* my *Sermon*, I am resolved to endeavour to do it, however you discourage me from it, p. 53. Nor do I much doubt of the Success. One thing I must wonder at from *You*, tho' it was design'd as a *Direction* to me in that Justification; and that is, to find my self *ridiculed*, p. 56. for supposing that the *Committee* mean't to support their *Charge*, by what They *quoted* out of my *Sermon*; and for not imagining that They

made several *Citations* from thence, professedly to support it, without any such View, or Design: Because I think this a much harder Reflexion upon *Their Representation*, than upon *Me*: And I ought to have beg'd Pardon of Them, if I had once admitted such a Thought, till I had it, in publick, under the Hand of *One of Themselves*.

I think, indeed, that *You*, of all Persons, should neither envy, nor forbid me the Use of All possible Helps, in order to cover my Meaning, or to support it; nor intimate it to be so very impracticable a Work to *justify* my *Sermon*, who have shewn me so easy a way, in *your own Example*. I have an equal Right to lead the *Reader*, backwards and forwards, in my own *Labyrinths*, till He hath lost sight of every thing that can lead Him out again. I have an equal Right peremptorily to fix *my own Sense* to *my own Words*; let the Sound of them be what it will. I can allege that I could mean nothing about the *Civil Power* under a *Head*, nay in a *Sermon* which professedly treats of the *Church* only, p. 37. I have the same Right to maintain that whatever I said of *Authority*, or *Sanctions*, ought to be interpreted of them, as used in the *Church of Rome*. And when all will not do, but I am driven out of these Holds, I have the same common Right to complain of the Poverty and *Difficulties* of my *Mother-tongue*, p. 42. and the same Privilege of declaring I will explain my self no farther

farther. I might have hoped that *you*, who have Your self claim'd the *privilege* of an Uncommon *Latitude* and *Comprehension*, in the fixing and defending your own Meaning, which all the World understood differently from what You have now seem'd to make it, would not, at the same time, have thought or declared it so impossible a thing to defend *Any Sermon* in the World.

But that which encourages me in my *Resolution* of endeavouring to *justify* what I preach'd is, the Assurance you give the World, about the *Part* You will take in the *Defense* of the *Representation*: Which I esteem as a *Promise*, and not as a *Threatning*. I am so far from being uneasy at it, that I am pleas'd to think that so able and so learned a Man hath publickly engaged himself to join in the clearing to the World so noble and so important a Subject. And if I might be so happy as to know how to distinguish that part from *Others*, I assure you, I would shew a particular Respect to it in my *Future Reply*. But The *Majority* of the *Committee*, I am persuaded, are not so blind, as not to see that *They* and *You*, are as distant from one another, in your *Sentiments*, and the *Grounds* upon which they are built; as *They* and *I*, can possibly be supposed to be.

I cannot forbear to put you in Mind, before I conclude, that the *Censures* designed in *Convocation*, and the *Clamours* consequent,

sequent upon them, do not always light up-
 on the *most Unworthy* of *our Body*, as They
 have at this time. You must, methinks,
 remember in a particular manner, that the
first Demand, and *Loud Cry* for the meeting
 of a *Convocation*, in a *Late Reign*, was
 founded, and declared to be founded, upon
 the Necessity and Resolution, of publickly
 censuring a *Great Man*, with whom I am
 not worthy to be compared; but whose
Memory is Dear to you, beyond all the Rest
 of the World: And this for having endea-
 vour'd to explain and vindicate a *Doctrine*
 of the *Church*, in the Integrity as well as
 Zeal of his Heart. I leave the application
 of this, to your self: And will only add the
 following Sentence.

As I never did, through my whole Life,
 either advise, or approve, the applying of
Humane Authority, or any sort of *Personal*
Censure, to Any Man living for the sake
 of *Different Sentiments* in *Religion*, or *Politi-*
tics; or argue for any such thing, but in
 the Case of *Outward Acts* immediately af-
 fecting the *Public Safety*: As I could have
 endured almost any *Temporal Evil*, sooner
 than have acted such a *Part* against you, as
 I have experienced against *my self*: So, I pro-
 mise that I will never suffer, upon any ac-
 count in the Word, *Any such Trust* to be
reposed in Me, as can oblige me to at-
 tempt

tempt, or assist, or encourage, in any degree, in any Time to come, the like *Usage*, of *You*, or of Any Man living. I am with the sincerest Wishes of True Friendship,

S I R,

Yours, &c.

B. BANGOR.



BOOKS Printed for James Knap-
ton, at the Crown in St. Paul's
Church-Yard.

SOME Remarks on Mr. *Marshall's* De-
fense of our Constitution, in Church and
State. With an Appendix. Containing a
Brief Enquiry into the Meaning of those
Words of the 20th Article, The Church
hath—Authority in Controversies of Faith.
By *Arthur Ashley Sykes*, M. A. Rector of
Dry-Draughton, near *Cambridge*.

Christian Morals and Christian Prudence.
In Two Parts. Wherein is shewn the pecu-
liar Wisdom and Beauty of the Christian Re-
ligion, in its general Design of promoting those
two excellent Ends so perfective of Hu-
mane Nature, *Purity and Peace*. By *John*
Laurence, M. A. Rector of *Telvertoft* in
Northamptonshire.

A Collection of Papers, which passed be-
tween the late Learned Mr. *Leibnitz*, and Dr.
Clarke, in the Years 1715. and 1716. Re-
lating to the Principles of *Natural Philosophy*
and *Religion*. With an Appendix. To
which are added, Letters to Dr *Clarke* con-
cerning Liberty and Necessity; From a Gen-
tleman of the University of *Cambridge*: With
the Doctor's Answers to them. Also Re-
marks upon a Book, Entitled, *A Philosophical*
Enquiry concerning Humane Liberty. By *Samuel*
Clarke, D. D. Rector of St. *James's*
Westminster.

nap-
aul's

De-
and
ng a
those
urch
Faith.
or of

lence.
pecu-
n Re-
those
Hu-
John
oft in

ed be-
nd Dr.
Re-
osophy
To
e con-
a Gen-
With
so Re-
osophical
By Sa-
James's